

I Have perused this Vindication of
The Doctrine and Practise of Pædo-
baptisme, in which the Reverend Au-
thour hath also handled some things
not usually treated on by any, in our
Language, which he submits to the
judgement of the learned and judici-
ous; And I commend to be Im-
printed.

Ja. Cranford. May 22. 1645.

I Have perused this Vindication of
The Doctrine and Practise of Pædo-
baptisme, in which the Reverend Au-
thour hath also handled some things
not usually treated on by any, in our
Language, which he submits to the
judgement of the learned and judici-
ous; And I commend to be Im-
printed.

Ja. Cranford. May 22. 1645.

THE
DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE
OF
PAEDOBAPTISME,
Asserted and Vindicated.

By a large and full improovement of some principall
Arguments for it, and a briefe Resolution of such
materiall Objections as are made against it.

Whereunto is annexed a briefe and plaine Enarration,
both Doctrinall and Practicall, upon
Mark 10. v. 13. 14. 15. 16.

As it was sometime since Preached in the Church of
Great Tarmouth.

Now published for an Antidote against those yet sprea-
ding Errours of the times.

Anabaptisme and Catabaptisme.

By JOH. BRINSLEY.

*Tanto magis pro infantibus loqui debemus, quanto minus ipsi pro
se loqui possunt. August. ad Hil. Ep. 89.*

7611. 104

London, Printed for Charles Greene, and are to be sold
at his Shop in Ivie Lane at the signe of the Gun, 1645.

THE

DOCTRINE

OF

EDD

Alfred and





To all the true Lovers of Truth and
Peace in the Church of England,
Specially those in the Towne of Great Yarmouth.

IO You have I dedicated this part of
my labours, to whom I have devoted
all. What sad and dangerous distem-
pers have invaded the Ecclesiasti-
call body of this Kingdome in this spring-time of
Reformation, I shall not need to tell you ; there
being scarce any part of it but feels of them, and la-
bours under them. Heereupon it hath beene, and is
my highest ambition, to shew my selfe (what one of
the Pen-men of sacred Writ is said to have been,
and what every Minister of the Gospel, (at this
time specially) ought to be) both an Evangelist,
and a Phyfician. To this end I have already ad-
ventured abroad some Counfells and Prescripts,
which being proper for the place where Providence
hath laid out my Praefice, may also (if rightly ap-
plied) proove not unusefull to others. And to the
same end it is that I have now sent this Treatate
after them ; wherein you have a Topicall Reme-

Col. 4. 14.
Lucas de Me-
dico corporum
factus jam e-
rat Medicus a-
nimarum.
Hieron. in ep.
ad Phil.

The healing
of Israels brea-
ches An. 1642.
Church-Re-
formation.
An. 1643.
Church-Re-
medy.
An. 1644.

M. Marthals
Sermon.
M. Cooke.
Dr. Featly &c.
Gen. 38. 30. 31

dy for that spreading Gangrene of Anabaptism,
which, unlesse timely prevented, may prove farall
to the whole body both of this Church and State.
This evill beginning to shew it selfe as in some other
parts adjacent, so in this place, which God hath in
part committed to my Cure, I was induced some-
time since to encounter with it in the Pulpit. My
endeavours beerein (I blesse God) I found not alto-
gether unsuccessfull. And beereupon I am now the
rather encouraged to present them to a more publick
view. Wherein, if any shall conceive my service
needlesse, in regard of the divers learned Treatises
of this kinde already published, I shall only desire
them to believe, that (as, however those Pharez-
zes were first brought forth, yet this Zarah put
forth the hand before most of them, the Pulpit be-
ing for most part delivered of the one, before the
Presse was of the other so) they shall meet with som-
what beere, which they may yet call New. Amongst
other passages I shall humbly take leave to Apolo-
gize for one, which possibly may rise in the stomach
of some, viz. the Holding forth of Confirmati-
on (as it is called) in the primitive simplicity of
it, for an Apostolicall Ordinance. This (I con-
fesse)

Jesse) took the first light from learned and judi-
 cious M. Calvin, as he himselfe, though he would
 (a) not from Sr. (b) Hierome, yet after upon second
 thoughts, did from Sr. (c) Paulus. And finding it a
 point so usefull, not only in the present controversy
 of Baptisme, but also for the healing of some
 of the chiefe differences of the times, viz. about
 mixt. Communion, and Church Covenant, I
 could not but hold forth that little light concerning
 it, which I have received from some others, such
 as were in their times magna Ecclesiae lumina,
 (d) stars of the first magnitude, (e) burning and
 shining Lamps. If any shall not beereby see what
 others have done, and my selfe imagine to doe, I
 shall only crave of them, first to take off that filme
 of prejudice which possibly the grosse corruption of
 this supposed Ordinance in the former practise of
 it, both in the Church of Rome, and amongst our
 selves, may have drawen over their eyes, and then
 I shall freely leave them to beleeve and report what
 they see. For my selfe, let the World know, all that
 beerein I desire and aime at, to be onely this, That
 If there be any thing Apostolicall in this Or-
 dinance, it may be revived and received: other-
 wise.

(a) Non infior, in eo
 nonnihil hal-
 lucinari Hieronymum,

quod Apostolicam esse observationem
 dicit, viz. Confirmationem.
 Calv instit. l. 4
 c. 19. S. 4.

(b) Hieron. contra Lucif.

(c) Heb. 6. 2.

Hic unus locus abunde testatur hujus Ceremoniae

(sc. Impositionis manuum

in Confirmatione) originem fluxisse

ab Apostolis.

Cat. Com. in ep. ad Heb. ca.

6. v. 2.

(d) Rey. i. 16. 20.

(e) Joh. 5. 35.

wise if meere Prudentiall, (as an explicate
Church-Covenant (so far forth as distinct from
the Covenant of Grace) is supposed to be) then
how farre to bee embraced or rejected, I leave it to
those who have Authority and Ability, to judge:
With the submissive tender of which humble motion,
I shall sit downe, and rest

Yarmouth June 26.
Anno 1645.

Yours in the service

of Christ,

Ioh. Brinsley.

THE



THE
Doctrine and Practice
OF
PÆDOBAPTISME
Asserted and Vindicated.

H B B. 6. 2.

The Doctrine of Baptismes.



Baptisme, it is a *Sacrament*, a *Sacrament* of the *New Testament*, the *first Sacrament* of the *New Testament*, *instituted* by *Christ*, to be *dispensed* by his *Ministers*; upon these particulars I have already insisted. It remains now that we come in the next place to the *Subject* of Baptisme, which because at the present it is made the subject of great debate and controversie, I shall therefore take leave to dwell a little the longer upon it.

Q. The Question is, Who they are that may and ought to be baptized?

B

A. To

The Subject of Baptisme,

Q. Who may and ought to be baptized.

The Doctrine and Practice

A. Such as are in Covenant with God.

Gen. 17. 13. 14

Baptisme a seale of the Covenant already made.

Gen. 17. 1. 2.

Verf. 9. 10.

Act. 2. 38.

1. All such as are in Covenant, may and ought to be baptized.

Gen. 17. 1. 2. 13. 14

Gen. 17. 1. 2. 13. 14

A. To this we may returne a generall answer; viz. Such as are in Covenant with God. Baptisme it is a seale of the Covenant, even as Circumcision was; which is therefore called by the name of the Covenant [My Covenant shall be in your flesh.] So is Baptisme a seale of the Covenant, viz. the Covenant of Grace, and of that Covenant already made. Marke that: A Covenant is first agreed upon, the writings drawne, before it be sealed. Thus men must first be in Covenant with God, before they partake of this Seale. Thus it was in Circumcision, God first maketh a Covenant with Abraham and his Seed; then for the confirmation of it he commandeth him and his to be circumcised. And thus it is in Baptisme, persons must first be in Covenant with God before they be baptized. They must be such as lye under the promise. [Repent and be baptized (saith Peter to the Jewes) for the promise is to you and to your children.]

Persons to be baptised must be [such as are in Covenant] Such; understand it as we will, Inclusively, Exclusively: All such, and onely such. Both true.

1. All such, of what Nation, sex, age, condition soever, Jew or Gentile, male or female, young or old, bond or free, &c. being in Covenant with God, they both may, and ought to partake of this Seal of the Covenant. When God instituted the Sacrament of Circumcision, Abraham and all his family were circumcised. [In the selfe same day was Abraham circumcised, and all the men of his house.] And the like we read of Baptisme: As it came in the room of Circumcision, being the initiall seal of the Covenant as Circumcision was, so it was administered after the same manner, to the whole family. Where the head of the family believed, presently we read

of PEDOBAPTISME.

read that they, and all theirs were baptized. Thus we read in that 16. of the Acts; first of *Lydia*, v. 15. *God having opened her heart, she was baptized and her household.* Then of the *Layleur*, v. 33. being wrought upon by the Apostles Ministry, [*he came and was baptized, he and all his.*] Thus, be they what they will, being once in Covenant, they may and ought to be baptized. So runs the Apostles Commission, [*Go teach all Nations*, Mat. 28. 19.]

And will you have the ground and reason of it, why the administration of this Ordinance should be so universal, consider but these two things; 1. The universality of mans sin and misery: and secondly, The universality of Gods offer of grace and mercy.

1. *Mans misery is universall.* [*All have sinned*, Rom. 3. 23.] And sinning died. [*Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned*, Rom. 5. 12.] Such is the condition of all the sonnes of men by nature. They are all concluded, and shut up under sinne and death; so shut up, as without the free grace of God in Christ pardoning their finnes, and healing their natures, they cannot possibly be saved. Even *Infants* that never sinned after the similitude of *Adams transgression*, viz. by committing actuall sinne, yet being *sinners by nature*, by nature children of wrath, they stand in need of Christ as well as any others. And consequently they stand in need of this *Laver of regeneration*, this *Sacrament of initiation*, whereby their spirituall washing from the guilt and spot of sinne, and their ingrafting into Christ may be sealed up unto them, and declared unto others. All sorts of persons stand in need of Christ, and consequently of this *Sacrament* which sealeth up their interest in Christ.

1. The tender of Gods grace and mercy universal.

Gal. 3. 28.

1 Cor. 12. 13.

2. Only such as are in Covenant may be baptised.

The Churches rule, the rule of charity.

2. And secondly, as mans misery is universal, so is the tender of Gods grace and mercy, held forth to all men, [*Goe teach all Nations, Mat. 28.*] [*Goe preach the Gospel to every creature, Mark 16. 15.*] Thus Christ sent forth his Apostles; and thus he now sendeth forth his Ministers, with Commission to offer Christ and salvation by Christ, to all that will receive him, believe on him, submit to him. And reaching forth the thing signified, hee also reacheth forth the signe, even this Sacrament of Baptisme, which is therefore to be administred alike unto all, because Christ is offered alike unto all, (I meane all sorts of persons) and is alike to all. [*There is neither Jew, nor Greeke, (i.e. Gentile) there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Iesus.*] Being all alike in Christ, they ought alike to be baptised into him. [*By one spirit we are all baptised into one body, whether we be Jewes or Gentiles, &c.*] Thus all that are in Covenant ought to be baptised.

2. And (in the second place.) *Onely they.* This being a seale of the Covenant ought not to be administred unto any, but unto those which are, or in the judgement of charity may be thought to be within the Covenant. By this rule must the Church proceed in dispensing of this Ordinance, not by the judgement of *Infallibility*, and *Certainty*, but of *Charity*. To know infallibly who is within the Covenant, this none can doe but God, and a mans owne soule. *The Churches rule is the rule of charity.* Those who by the law of charity may be thought, and are to be reputed within the *Covenant of Grace*, they, all they, and only they may, and ought to partake of this Ordinance.

Q. Here then the great Question now falls in: *Who they are that in the judgement of charity are to be thought to be within the Covenant?*

Q Who may be thought to be within the Covenant.

A. Hereunto we answer: *All that professe the faith of Christ and their children.* Both these the eye of charity looketh upon as *Christians*, and being such, it cannot deny them the *badge of their Christianity*, the seal of that Covenant wherein they are presumed to be.

A. All that professe the faith of Christ, and their children.

As for the former of these, we shall meet with no great difference about them. *Persons professing the faith of Christ may, and ought to be baptised.* For this Scripture is expresse: When the *Eunuch* put the question to *Philip*, [*See here it water, what doth hinder me to be baptised?*] *Philip* returns him this answer: *If thou beleevest with all thine heart, thou mayest.* Those three thousand Converts *Act. 2.41.* upon the receiving of *Peters word*, his doctrine, they were baptised. Thus *Simon Magus*, and the rest of *Samaria*, upon their beleeving, i. e. making a profession of faith, they were baptised both men and women. Thus all that professe the faith of Christ (professing it with their *mouths*, and not denying it in their *lives*) they have a right unto *Baptisme*. And why? Because in judgement of charity they are to be reputed *Christians*, and to be within the Covenant.

Professours of the faith baptiseable.

Act. 8. 36.

Verf. 37.

Act. 12. 22.

True it is, if we speake of *Christians in truth*, in reality, then they only are *Christians* who have received Christ into their hearts by *faith and love*, in whose hearts Christ is formed. [*He is not a Jew* (saith the Apostle) *which is one outwardly.*] And so may we say, He is not a *Christian* that is one outwardly, that hath only the name and profession of a *Christian*. Yet in a large sense, they which make so much as a *generall profession*

Generall profession makes a *Christian*.

Rom. 2.

Gal. 4. 19.

Act. 11. 26.

of Christ, of faith in Christ, and subjection to Christ, they are to be accounted Christians. And by vertue thereof they may and ought to be baptised. Upon this profession *Iohn the Baptist* baptized those that came unto him. And so did the Apostles those which came unto them, however in some of them, that profession was hypocritical and unsound, as in *Simon Magus, Ananias & Saphira, &c.* yet the Apostles looking upon them with an eye of charity, and judging of them according to their profession, they admitted them unto this Ordinance. Neither doe we read of any whom they refused, or yet brought to an exacter scrutiny and tryall, touching the inward worke of grace in their hearts, who did make such a profession and confession.

Mat. 3.

Act 5. and 8.

Persons come to years of discretion how they ought to be admitted to Baptisme.

Mat. 3.6.
Act. 19.4.

And thus ought all those who are come to yeares of discretion before they are baptised, be admitted to it. As *viz.* Pagans and Infidels, such as are borne and brought up without the pale of the Church, not descended from Christian parents. Before they be admitted to this Sacrament, they ought first to be instructed in the faith of Christ, in the principles and rudiments of Christian Religion. Being thus instructed then they are to declare and testifie their voluntary imbracing of that faith, together with their *repentance*, by open *Profession* and *Confession*. Such was the manner of *Iohns* baptisme, having to deale with unbeleeving Jewes: He baptised them *confessing their sinnes*, and professing their faith in the *Messiah*. Thus the Apostles having to deal with unbeleeving *Gentiles*, heathens, they first preached to them as *Iohn the Baptist* did, and then baptised them upon the confession of their sinnes, and profession of their faith. And such was the practice of the *Primitive Church*.

Church in like cases. Having to deale with *Infidels*, they first catechised them, instructed them in the principles of Christian Religion (whence they were called by the name of *Catechumeni*, persons that were to be catechised.) That being done, and they brought to some measure of knowledge, then they declared and testified their *repentance* and *faith* by an open and publick confession in the congregation where they were to be baptised. And this they did (as it seemeth) by answering unto some *questions* which were propounded to them by the Minister. To which practise St. Peter seemeth to allude, 1 Pet. 3. 21. where speaking of *Baptisme*, he calleth it, *Συνείσθησις ἀγαθῆς ἐνσυνείσθησις* the answer of a good conscience towards God. The answer of a good conscience in Baptisme, what.

So our translation renders it, though (as Beza notes upon the place) not so fully expressing the force of the word *ἐπερωτήματα*, which properly signifieth an *Interrogating*, a *Questioning*. So the vulgar *Latine* there renders it, *Interrogatio bonæ conscientie*, the *Interrogation of a good conscience*. Which though it be somewhat obscure, yet it will lead us to the right understanding of that phrase. Beza translates it, *Stipulatio bonæ conscientie*, the *stipulation of a good conscience*. Now *stipulation* properly it is an answer to an *Interrogation*; when one being demanded concerning a thing, he returnes answer, and by his answer ingageth himselfe to doe somewhat that is demanded and required of him. Such a *Stipulation* there was in Baptisme, where the party to be baptised being demanded by the Minister concerning his repentance and faith, he made answer before the congregation, professing both, and obliging himselfe to both. Such an *ἐπερωτήματα* such a *stipulation* we finde betwixt Philip and the *Eunuch*, A. 8. 37. 38. The *Eunuch* desiring Baptisme.

Baptisme, *Philip* interrogates him concerning his faith, [*If thou beleevest, &c.*] To this the *Eunuch* answereth, [*I beleeve that Iesus is the Sonne of God.*] And such was the practice of the Primitive times. Those which tendered themselves to Baptisme, being *Adulti*, able to answer for themselves, (of which sort then there were many) they had certaine questions propounded to them, to which they made answer, as, *Credis? Credo. Abrenuncias? Abrenuncio. Dost thou beleeve? (saith the Minister) I doe beleeve (saith the party) Dost thou renounce the Devill and his pompes? &c. I doe renounce them.* Such was their manner then of Baptizing persons come to yeares of discretion; which as *Beza* notes upon that place of *Peter*) after ages out of a *κατασκευα*, a *perverse imitation*, drew downe and applied to the Baptisme of Infants; but not so fitly, they being not able to answer for themselves. And this was the *stipulation* which *St. Peter* there speaketh of, and to which he attributes that saving property, [*it saveth us,*] which is the fruit and effect not of the outward Baptisme, the putting away the filth of the flesh, bodily washing: but the inward Baptisme testified by the answer or stipulation of a good conscience towards God. To which agreeth that of *Tertullian* cited there by *Beza* as an apt glosse upon that Text. *Anima non lavatione, sed responsione sanatur. In Baptisme the soule is healed not by washing, but by answering;* even by that answer of a good conscience. Thus were their *Adulti*, persons come to yeares of discretion baptised then. And after the same manner ought they to be baptised now. But I will not dwell upon this, wherein wee are all agreed.

Beza Annot.
in 1 Pet. 3. 21.

The maine businesse we have to deale with, and that which I chiefly aimed at, when I fell upon this Subject, is touching the *Baptisme of Infants*; whether they, or any of them may be baptized. Here the *Anabaptists* and we are at variance. We allow it to some, they deny it to all. Whence it is they are called by the name both of *Anabaptists* and *Catabaptists*; because they oppose the Baptisme of all Infants, as a thing not onely inconvenient, but unlawfull; and in case any of them bee baptized in their infancie, they looke upon that Baptisme as a nullity, and so impose upon them a *Rebaptization* when they come to yeares of discretion.

Baptisme of Infants.

With this *Error* of theirs I am now to encounter. An *Error* not only opposing the constant and universall practice of all the Churches of God in the world, but dangerous and pernicious to them, tending directly not only to the *unchurching*, but *unchristianing* of them. Of such consequence is this *doctrine* of theirs, that if it be true, there are but a few *Christians* to be found this day in the world.

Anabaptisme a dangerous error.

To vindicate the *truth of God*, and the *practice of the Churches*; as also for the staying of unstable soules, who are subject in these unsetled times to be carried away into this Error amongst others: Come we as plainly as we can to joyne issue with them, putting it to the tryall, *whether any Infants be baptizeable or no.*

So I shall state the controversie, and that to prevent impertinent disputes, and collaterall differences, which otherwise might fall in betwixt us, and the *Semi-Anabaptist*, or else some others of our *Brethren*, who deny baptisme unto some Infants, though borne of believing parents, upon other grounds, which now I forbear

Q. Whether Infants be baptizeable, or no.

The Question
Arises.

Infants of be-
lieving pa-
rents are sub-
jects capable
of Baptism.

Proved by ar-
guments.

of mind
and reason
be baptized
because with-
in the Com-
munion.

to mention only quoniam hoc est verum the Com-
plant Anabaptist, who holdeth that Infants & Infants
are not baptizable, &er their parents be never so holy,
and the children of the Church in all other respects never so pure,
and regular. To meet with them, I propound the que-
stion in these termes.

Q. Whether children of the holiest parents, and in the
purest Churches, may and ought to be baptized in their in-
fancy? Of this question we maintain the Affirmative,
that they may, and ought, they the Negative, that they
neither ought, nor may. It remains then that we come
to see what can be said of either side. I shall begin
with the Affirmative, shewing you what grounds, what
warrant we have for our doctrine and practice. Then
come to the Negative, shewing what they can say by
way of opposition against it.

Begin with the former, pleading for our selves, and
all the Churches of Christ; whose very practice in all
ages, in all places of the world for so many hundred
yeares together ought not to be despised by us. Let
nothing that passes in Infants of believing parents be sub-
jected capable of Baptism. This we might prove by di-
vers arguments. Take but two of the chiefest. The first
is, that there is no new order in the Gospel in this
point, as there is expected in the reproofing of
old ones, the doing none of those which have
been formerly observed in the Church of Christ by
the Apostles and their Successors. But enough is already
said of this point of order, which I have already said
in the former part of my Discourse. Where I think the
Reader will be content to see the same thing repeated.
From hence we may gather, that the practice of baptizing
Infants is not only lawful, but also necessary.

be within the Covenant then they may be baptized. But they are within the Covenant, Therefore they may be baptized.

The former of these is evident, & and I think it will not be denied. To whomsoever the Covenant it self belongeth, to them belongeth this *seal* of the Covenant. *Abrahams* posterity being in Covenant, they were to receive the *seal* of the Covenant, *viz.* the *signe of circumcision*. Thus Christians the spirituall seed of faithfull *Abraham*, being in Covenant with God, they are capable of *baptisme*, this initiall *seal*, which sealeth up unto them, and testifieth unto others their entrance into Covenant.

The maine difference here betwixt us and the Anabaptist will lye about the second of these, *viz.* Whether *Infants of believing parents be in Covenant or no*. This they deny, alledging that the Covenant, being a Covenant of *Grace*, it doth not runne along with the *blood*, it is not transmitted from the *parent* to the *childe*, neither is it intayled upon any *family*, any *kindred*. No, *That which is borne of the flesh is flesh* (say they.) As for *children*, they are all alike borne *children of wrath*, neither are the children of believing parents herein privileged. [There is no difference (saith the Apostle) for all have sinned, and are deprived of the glory of God.] No difference here between the children of *Christians*, and *Pagans*, *Believers*, and *Infidels*, the one is no more in Covenant then the other by nature. Neither are men brought into Covenant by *natural generation*, but by *spirituall Regeneration*. They must first be *born againe*, otherwise they have nothing to doe with the Covenant. Thus they. But with what truth, it will appeare by these two or three arguments.

1. 218-
mon 234T
08 88 4.08

notion 1

Infants of
believing pa-
rents, are to
be reputed in
Covenant.

Rom. 3. 22. 23.

Proved by 3
Arguments.

Arg. 1.
Taken from
Act. 2. 38. 39.

Children of believing parents are within the covenant.
What else (in the first place) meanes that of the Apostle
St. Peter in that knowne place: Act. 2. where he tel-
leth those new Converts, that *The promise was to them,*
and to their children, v. 39. and thereupon invited them
to come and be baptized, as you have it in the verse
foregoing. [*The promise is unto you and to your children.*]

Explication.

For the explicating of that Text, and for the vindi-
cating of it from the cavills and evasions of our Adver-
saries, I shall open and unfold unto you these two things:
1. What is there meant by the *Promise*; and secondly,
what by their *Children*.

Q. 1.
What meant
by the Pro-
mise.

Verf. 38.

Act. 2.

Act. 2.

1. For the former of these, we finde the Anabaptists
nibbling at it; some of them referring it to the words im-
mediately foregoing, viz. [*The receiving of the Holy*
Ghost.] This is the promise (say they) here spoken of,
viz. of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. But against
them the evidence is cleare. The Promise here spoken
of is the *great Promise of the Gospel*, called here by way
of emphasis, [*The Promise,*] viz. the promise of *Re-*
mission of sinnes, which he willet them to seeke, in, by,
and thorough Christ. This promise he here holdeth
forth unto them; and for the bearing up of their droo-
ping dejected spirits, he tells them that that *Promise* be-
longed to them, and their children. Not the promise of
the *Holy Ghost* in those extraordinary gifts, which was
peculiar to that age, and to some peculiar persons therein,
not common to all that were baptized into the name of
Iesus Christ.

Q. 2.
What by chil-
dren.

Act. 2.

But what is here meant by their *Children*?
To this the Anabaptist answers, not Children in age,
young Infants. Who then? Why either children by
regene-

regeneration, (So Calvin tells us some of them expound the word there in a *metaphoricall* sense, purposely to evade and elude the force of it;) Or else (as the greatest part of them carry it) children by *succession*, their posterity that should come after them being come to yeares of discretion. So they all edge the word (*Children*) to be often used in Scripture. *Act. 3. 25. Ye are the children of the Prophets. Act. 13. 26. Men and brethren, Children of the stock of Abraham.*] Thus would they have the word here understood. [*You and your Children*] i.e. (say they) the lineally descended sons of *Abraham*, men and women of full age.

Calv. ad loc.
Not children
by Regenera-
tion,
Or Succession.

A. But to this cavill of theirs we reply. The word (*Children*) there must be taken *literally* and *properly*, and be understood of *Infants*, Children in age.

But children
in Age.

For prooffe of this, I finde the *scope* and *drift* of the place brought in by some, which seemeth (I confesse) to favour this construction. But in as much as I find that variously carried according to divers apprehensions of it, I shall passe it by, fastening upon that which I conceive to be more demonstrative and convincing. I take it from the words themselves, Wherein we may take notice of three severall *ranks* or *conditions* of persons to whom the Apostle here affirms this promise to belong. 1. The *ones* themselves there present; 2. Their *Children*; 3. Those which were *a far off*; But who were they?

Vid. Robinson
Bap. of Infants
Arg. 5.

The Promise
said to belong
to three sorts
of persons.

2. Who were those *a far off*? The opening of that clause will conduce much to the clearing of the former. [*Them which are a far off.*] This I know Expositors generally, both *Protestant* and *Papist*, understand of the *Gentiles*, who were then *a far off*, at a great distance from

Q.
Who were
those a far off?
Calvin;
Piscator.
A Lapide.

Not the Gen-
tiles, as it is u-
sually expoun-
ded.

Ephes. 2. 17.

vers. 13.

Beza ad loc.

Proved by two
reasons.

Peter was not
yet fully in-
structed in
this mystery
touching the
calling of the
Gentiles.

Act. 10.

Vers. 13.

28.

34.

No fit time to
preach this do-
ctrine.

the Jew in point of Religion. For countenance of this ex-
position, they bring in that known place of the Apostle,
Eph. 2. 17. where speaking of the *Jews & Gentiles*, he de-
scribeth each by a *Periphrasis*, the one a people a *far off*,
the other *neer*. The Gentiles before the coming of
Christ they were a *far off*. [*Ye who sometimes were a far
off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. 13. of that 2. Eph.*]
Thus they expound *Peter* by *Paul*, generally looking
upon these texts in *2. Ephes.* as a Comment upon that in
the *2. of the Acts*.

But herein I find *Mr. Beza* dissenting from them, and
that (as I conceive) not without good ground and war-
rant. By those a *far off* in that place (saith he) cannot be
understood the *Gentiles*. Why not? Take a double
reason for it, each convincing.

1. The calling of the *Gentiles* was as yet in a great
part a *mysterie* to *Peter* himself, A secret which was not
yet clearly unfolded unto him. So much we may col-
lect from that vision presented to him, *Act. 10.* whereby
taking away the difference betwixt the *cleane* beasts and
uncleane, bidding him *slay and eat, &c.* The Lord taught
him not to put a difference betwixt *Jew* and *Gentile*. So
as it is evident, *Peter* was not so well instructed in this
mysterie before, as that he should tell the *Jews* so ex-
pressly, that the *promise* belonged as well to the *Gentiles*,
as to them.

2. Suppose *Peter* had understood this mysterie, yet
was this no fit time to have preached and published this
doctrine to these weak *Jews*, being then but novices, be-
gining to look towards Christ, to whom it might ra-
ther have been a *stumbling-block* to keep them back, then
any *incouragement* to bring them to Christ. To hear
that

that the *Gentiles* were alike interested in the Promise with them; it could be no argument to perswade them to come in unto Christ. Vpon these grounds he concludes (and I think very rationally) that by those a *far off* cannot be meant the *Gentiles*.

Who then? Why the *posterity of these Jewes*, who were to succeed them in the ages to come, who were then a *far off* in *time*. Mark it. Not *Gentiles* a *far off* in *state* and condition, but *Jewes* a *far off* in *time*, such as were to be born in after ages. That the phrase here must be so understood, *Bez* well evinceth it from the original: where he takes notice of a remarkable difference betwixt *Pauls* words, and *Peters*: *Paul* speaking of the *Gentiles* in that *Ephe*, he calleth them [*τῶν παγεῖν*] but *Peters* words here are [*τῶν ἐκ παλαιῶν*] the one importing a distance of *state*, the other of *time*. And so indeed the Greek phrase [*ἐκ παλαιῶν*] properly signifieth; such as are a *far off* in *time*, *ἐκ παλαιῶν ἡμερῶν* (as *Piscator* makes it out) *longè post futuris* (as *Bez* translates it) such as were to be born a long time after.

But the posterity of the Jewes, a *far off* in time,

Now then (to winde up what I have ravelled) If by those a *far off*, be meant not the *Gentiles*, but the *Jewes* a *far off* in *time*, then by their *Children* here must be understood, not their *Posterity* which was to come after, but their *present issue*, the children that already were, or should be born of their bodies, what ever they were, whether of *riper*, or *younger* yeares, even *Infants*. To them (saith the Apostle) as well as you, belongeth this promise, this great promise, the promise of the *Messiah*, of life and salvation by Christ. So ran the promise made to *Abraham*: It took in his seed, his children: and to you shall that promise be made good, in case you repent and

What meant by Children.

and believe, and so approve your selves the children of faithfull *Abraham*, the promise will reach both you and your children. So then, (to close up this Argument) the promise belonging unto the children of believers, they are also in *Covenant*, and being in *Covenant*, the *Seale of the Covenant* is applicable unto them.

Object.

[As many as the Lord our God shall call] how to be understood.

Here I am not ignorant of that beaten muse wch the Anabaptists generally think to creep out at, that evasion whereby they think to elude the force of this argument. They find it (as they conceive) in the last clause of the verse, which they make use of as the Sea-man of his Rudder in the Stern, whereby he turns about the whole Ship; so they think hereby to turn about the whole Argument. This *promise* (say they) it belonged to them, and their *children*, and to those *a far off*, but how? *viz.* upon their *Calling*, So run the words; [*As many as the Lord our God shall call.*] Now indeed (say they) be they who, or what they will, they may lay claim to the promise, being once called, but not else.

A. To this we answer, That this Cavill of theirs, what force soever there may seem to be in it, yet it cannot reach the Argument in hand, inasmuch as that clause stands in reference only to the clause next foregoing, *viz.* [*Those which are a far off*] not reaching to the former, [*them and their children.*] As for them, the words run roundly and absolutely, putting them and their children together, without any note of distinction betwixt them, (as it is observable in all the originall copies that I can meet with) extending the promise alike unto both, and that without any limitation or restriction, [*The promise is unto you and your children.*] Not to as many of them as the Lord shall call, (as they would restraine it) but

but indefinitely to all of them; and [*of those which are a far off, even as many as the Lord shall call,*] as many of them that should succeed in after-generations; as the Lord should effectually call to repent and believe, they should partake in the same priviledge; The Promise should reach to them and to their children. So that let our adversary make what improvement he can of this allegation, unlesse he stretch it beyond the staple, and extend the words of the Apostle further then ever they were intended, and further then with any congruity they can reach, it cannot so much as touch, much lesse shake the Argument now laid down.

I passe to a 2^d, a second Argument to prove Infants of believing Parents to be within the Covenant.

Infants of believing parents were in Covenant under the Old Testament, therefore they are so under the New.

As for the Antecedent, the former part of this *Entby-meme*, viz. That *some Children were in Covenant under the Old Testament*, I think it will not be denied. If it should, the evidence is cleare; wherefore else were they *circumcised*? God did not put that this his *Seale*, to a *Blank*. [*This is my Covenant*] (saith the Lord) viz. a signe, a seale, a token of the Covenant, not to be administered unto any but such as were presumed to be in Covenant with God. Now from hence we inferre, If they were in Covenant then, then they are in Covenant now; If under the Old Testament, then under the New. This inference I shall evince and make good by three arguments.

Arg. 1. *Otherwise, Children now under the New Testament should be in a worse condition then they were under the Old; & so in stead of receiving benefit by the coming*

Arg. 2.

Some Infants were in Covenant under the Old Testament.

Gen. 17. 10, 11

Therefore some are in covenant now. Proved by 3 Arguments.

1. Otherwise Infants should be losers by the coming of Christ.

Nisi forte arbitramur Christum in suo adventu Patris gratiam immi-
nuisse aut decurtasse, quod execrabili blasphemiam non vacat. Calv.
Instit. l. 4. c. 16. S. 4.

Luk. 2. 10.

Robinson, bap.
of Infants.

The grace of
God should be
more large un-
der the Old
Testament,
than the New.

of Christ, they should be indamaged by it; They should be *losers* by Christ, which is monstrous to conceive. That the *Fathers* were *gainers* by the coming of Christ, brought into a better condition, Papists maintain: but that their *Children* should be *losers* by it, methinks *Anabaptists* should not dare to affirm. But so they must be, and great losers too, if whereas they were in Covenant before his coming, since his coming they should be excluded. Certainly, little cause had *John the Baptist* to have sprung for joy in his mothers wombe at the presence of Christ in his conception, had his birth been so disadvantageous to him, and others in that condition. Far be it from us to give way to such a thought. The coming of Christ, it was joyous to *all*, to all *nations*, all *sexes*, all *conditions*, all *ages*; advantageous to all, even to *Infants*.

It is well observed, *Christ did not only take the nature of man upon him, but the ages of man also, viz. Childhood, Youth, Manhood.* He passed through all these estates, to shew that he was the *Saviour*, the *Redeemer* of all, and that some of all these estates should have benefit by him, and amongst others, *Children*, to whom he shewed a peculiar affection when he was upon earth, (as God willing I shall shew you hereafter.) A plain evidence that he came not to disadvantage them in the great business of salvation, but to promote and further it.

2. Again (secondly) if Infants should be in Covenant under the Old Testament, and not under the New, then the *grace of God under the Old Testament should be more large then under the New*; and under the New more strait then under the Old. Under the Old Testament, the Covenant was, [*I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.*] The grace of God then extended not to the *Pa-*

rents.

rent only, but to the *Childe*. Now, if this grace should now be restrained only to the *Parent*, not reaching unto the *Child*, then the grace of the *New Testament* should be more strait then of the *Old*, which cannot be imagined without great wrong and injury to *Christ* himself, and his *Gospel*. As for *Christ*, we know he brought grace along with him, (as the *Sun* doth his *beames*.) *Grace and Truth came by (and with) Iesus Christ.*] *Grace*, and that *ample grace*. Such is the grace of the *New Testament*, reaching and spreading further then that of the *Old*. [*The grace of God which bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men*] (saith the *Apostle*) i. e. to all sorts, ages, and conditions of men. Therein is this grace more ample then it was under the *Law*. There the grace of God in an ordinary dispensation it was appropriated to the *Jews*. They were then the *μικροί*, Gods *favourites*, to whom his grace in *Christ* was manifested. But now that grace hath appeared to all men. The grace of the *Gospel* is more ample, and every wayes greater grace then that before, or under the *Law*. [*God having provided some better thing for us*] (saith the *Apostle*.) The *privileges* of the *Gospel* are more, and greater, and better, then those under the *Law*. Surely therefore, *Infants* being in *Covenant* then, they are not excluded now. Which if they be, but

3. Let it be shewed (in the third place) by what act they are excluded. If once they were in *Covenant*; let it be shewed when, and how they came to be ejected: how this *Magna Charta*, this *Great Charter*, granted first to *Abraham*, came to be forfeited, or when it was called in. How they who were once of Gods family, and wore his livery, came to be cashiered: How they, who were

Joh. 1. 17.

Tit. 2. 11.

Heb. 11. 40.

3. Infants not where cast out of the Covenant.

once *members* of the mysticall Body, came to be cut off. If our adversaries can shew us a *speciall warrant* for the calling in of this *act of grace* towards them (as they must, before we can give way to it) a *speciall and expresse order* to prohibit Infants from laying any further claime to that priviledge under the Gospel, which for so many ages they had beene peaceably possessed of under the Law; then we will hearken to them. Otherwise we must hold Infants to be in *statu quo*, in the same, or in a better state and condition now, then they were in under the Old Testament. Being in Covenant with God then, they are in Covenant with him now. And being in Covenant, they have right to this initiall scale of the Covenant.

I know what the Anabaptist will here reply to this Argument. Give me leave to meet with it, that I may cleare the way as I goe.

Replie.
These are two
distinct Cove-
nants.

Jer. 31. 31.
Heb. 8. 6.

The old Co-
venant aboli-
shed.
Heb. 7. 18.

The old Co-
venant, what

That Infants should be in Covenant under the New Testament, because they were so under the old, it followeth not (say they;) why? In as much as these are two *distinct Covenants*, not the same. For this (say they) Scripture is expresse; calling this Covenant which we have under the Gospel, a *New Covenant*, and a *better Covenant*, established upon better promises, &c. As for that *old Covenant* it is antiquated, and abrogated, being (as the Apostle tells us) *disannulled by reason of the weaknesse and unprofitablenesse thereof.* That Covenant then is now determined, neither have we any thing to doe with it under the Gospel. This is a new Covenant, not like the former.

A. For answer to this, in as much as it will make much to the clearing of this doctrine, and tend greatly to

to the satisfaction of those who desire it, give me leave briefly to shew you what the *old Covenant* was, which is there opposed to this *new Covenant*, and said to be abrogated, and abolished, &c.

Where, let God himselfe be his owne Interpreter In that 31. of *Jeremy*, v. 32. cited by the Apostle, Heb. 8. v. 9. the words are expresse. [*Behold the dayes come (saith the Lord) that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, &c.*] What Covenant? why marke what followes. *Not according to the Covenant which I made with their fathers in the day that I tooke them by the hand to bring them out of Egypt, &c.*] Marke it. This was the old Covenant so much spoken of in that Epistle to the *Hebrewes*. Not that Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. But that Covenant which he made with *Israel* at their comming out of Egypt, Exod. 19. These were two distinct Covenants: distinct, I say, whether in *kinde*, or only in *manner of administration*, I will not contend. A point worthy to be observed, as letting in much light to the controversie now in hand.

Not that made with *Abraham*, but the Covenant at Mount *Sina* which were

Two distinct Covenants.

Many remarkable *differences* there are betwixt them. To glean some of the handfulls that others have let fall.

Six differences betwixt them.

1. (In the first place) they differ in *time*. The Covenant made with *Abraham* was long before that other Covenant; even foure hundred and thirty yeares. So the Apostle tells us expressely, Gal. 3. 17. *The Covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was foure hundred and thirty yeares after cannot disanull.* So long was this Covenant after that Covenant made with *Abraham*.

Vid. Mr. Robinson Bap. of Infants, p. 77.

1. In time.

2. As they differ in *time*, so in *place*. The one made

2.

Place.

at Mount Sina, Exod. 19. the other first made with Abraham in *Vr of the Caldees*, Gen. 12. after renewed, and confirmed in Canaan, Gen. 15. and 17.

3.
Manner of
making and
dispensing.
Exod. 19.

3. They differ in the *manner* both of their *making*, and *dispensing*. The Law was given after a terrible manner, to declare the *Iustice* of God against the violaters and transgressours of that Covenant. But the Covenant made with Abraham, was made with all *sweetnes of love and mercy*, breathing forth nothing but *free grace*. And for the manner of their *dispensation*, that legall Covenant it was dispensed under *types and figures*, and ceremoniall observances. *It had Ordinances of divine service, and a wordly Sanctuary, &c.* (as the Apostle speaketh, Heb. 9. 1.) But the Covenant made with Abraham was more plainly and simply dispensed, having no other Ceremony annexed to it, but only *Circumcision*, which was a *scale* of that Covenant.

4.
Conditions.
Mr Robinson
ibid.

4. Again they differ in their *Conditions*. The condition of that legall Covenant at Mount Sina, was even the same for substance with that which God made with Adam in Paradise. [*Doe this and live.*] A legall condition; promising life, all earthly and heavenly blessings, upon the condition of perfect obedience to all the Commandements. Whereupon this Covenant, through mans corruption, and inability to keep it, it is said to be *weake*. [*It was weake through the flesh*, Rom. 8. 3. and *unprofitable*, Heb. 7. 18. *It was disannulled for the weaknesse and unprofitablenesse thereof.*] But now the condition of that Covenant made with Abraham was *Evangelicall*, viz. *Faith*, and *Evangelicall obedience*. *Faith*; Circumcision the *scale* of that Covenant was to Abraham a *scale of the righteousness of Faith*, sealing up unto

Rom. 4. 11.

unto him righteousness and life, not upon the condition of *doing, working, but believing*, which was accounted to him for *Righteousnesse*, (as the Apostle sets it forth, Rom. 4.) *Obedience*; not *exactnesse*, but *uprightness*, Gen. 17.1. *Walke before me, and be upright, or sincere.*

Verf. 9.22.

5. Againe (fifthly) they differ in the *end*, and *use* of them. That legall Covenant, it was given chiefly because of *transgressions*. So the Apostle tells us, Gal. 3.19. *wherefore then serveth the Law, it was added because of transgressions. viz. to discover them, to bridle and restrain men from them, to denounce punishments for them* (for that is a threefold use of the Law, 1. *Detegit.* 2. *Frénat.* 3. *Punit.*) to convince men of sinne, and of their misery by reason of sinne, that so they might come to see the need they have of Christ, and be driven to him, according to that of the Apostle, Gal. 3.24. *The Law was our School-master to bring us unto Christ.* But that other Covenant made with *Abraham*, it was to assure him, and his seed of their interest in the *Messiah*, and the promise of life through him.

5. End and use.

6. Sixtly, and lastly, They differ in their *duration* and *continuance*. That legall Covenant it was but *temporary*, to continue but till Christ should come. So saith the Apostle, Gal. 3.19. *The law was added because of transgressions, untill the seed should come to whom the promise was made* i. e. untill Christ should come. Then that legall Covenant as a Covenant with the Church, ceased. But the Covenant made with *Abraham* it was an everlasting Covenant. So the Lord tells him, Gen. 17.7. *I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee for an everlasting Covenant, &c.*

6. Continuance.

So

So then you see that these Covenants were two distinct Covenants. That Covenant which God made with *Israel* at *Mount Sina*, it was not the same with that which he had made with *Abraham* before.

And of that Covenant it is that the Apostle there speaketh in the 7. and 8. chap. of the Hebrewes. Not of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, which was an *Evangelicall Covenant*, and for substance the same with that which we are now under; But of the Covenant made at *Mount Sina*, that *legall Covenant*. That is the Covenant which the Apostle there compareth with the *new Covenant*, and of which he telleth us that it is now disannulled and abolished.

Q.
The Covenant at Mount Sina, why called the old Covenant, and first Covenant

A. 1.
In opposition to the Covenant of Grace under the New Testament.

Heb 8.13.

2.
Waxing old.

3.
The same for

Q. Why but (saith our Adversary) how could that be called the *old Covenant*, and the *first Covenant*, when as it was 430. years after the Covenant made with *Abraham*? This was rather the first Covenant, and old Covenant.

A. To this it is answered: That *legall Covenant* is called the *old Covenant*, 1. In opposition to the Covenant of the Gospell under the *new Testament*, which because it was revived and renewed, and confirmed by the coming of Christ, the promised seed, it is therefore peculiarly called the *new Covenant*, and that *legall Covenant* in opposition to it, is called the *old Covenant*.

2. The *old Covenant*, because it *waxed old*, and through age decayed. So saith the Apostle of it in the place last named, Heb. 8. last. [In that he saith a *new Covenant*, he hath made the *first old*, now that which decayeth, and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.]

3. The *old Covenant*, and the *first Covenant*, because

cause for substance it was partly the same with that first Covenant which God made with Adam in state of innocencie. The Law (the morall part of it) published upon Mount Sina, it was no other but the same Law that was given to Adam at the first. What was there written in *Tables of stone* was but a counterpane of what was written in the *fleshy Tables* of the heart of man at the beginning. And being so, well might it be called the *old Covenant*, and the *first Covenant*, being before the Covenant of Grace made with Abraham, I, or with Adam either.

substance with the first Covenant made with Adam in state of innocency.

2 Cor. 3. 3.

You see then what the *old Covenant* is, that *legall Covenant* whereof Moses was the Mediatour. And of this Covenant it is true, it is disanulled, abrogated, so as there is now no more use of the Law as a Covenant to the Church. Marke that, *as a Covenant*: Other uses there are of it many, which are still in force as much as ever: But it is no longer a Covenant. This Covenant is disanulled. But so is not that *Evangelicall Covenant* made with Abraham, which is (as I told you) an *Everlasting Covenant*, and for substance the very same with that which Believers are now under; *viz.* the *Covenant of Grace* promising life and salvation upon the condition of *believing*. So much the Apostle tells us expressly, Gal. 3. v. 8. *The Scripture* (i.e. the Spirit of God speaking in Scripture) *foreseeing that God would justify the heathen* (the Gentiles) *through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed.*] Marke it. When God made this Covenant with Abraham, declaring and promising that in his seed all the Nations of the earth should be blessed, he then preached the *Gospel* to him, making a Covenant

The old Covenant disanulled.

Not the Covenant with Abraham.

with him concerning Christ, and salvation by Christ. So much *Zacharias* in his song acknowledgeth, *Luke 1. 72, 73.* where speaking of the exhibiting and sending of Christ into the world, he calls it, *An holy Covenant, the oath which God swore unto our father Abraham.* The Covenant made with *Abraham* then was no other but the *Covenant of Grace*, even the same Covenant that we are now under. All the difference is, the Covenant now is *new drawne*, and so put into another forme, set forth and expressed more clearly and fully, then that with *Abraham* was, (even as our evidences and conveyances, now they are more large and full then they were wont to be in the dayes of our forefathers, though in effect the same) but for substance they are one and the same.

Jer. 32. 40.

And being so, (to close up this second Argument) that Covenant is an everlasting Covenant, (*I will make an everlasting Covenant with them*, saith the Lord, speaking of the renewing of the Covenant of Grace with them, *Jer. 32. 40.*) A Covenant that is not *waxed old* (as that legall Covenant did) that is not, nor ever shall be disannulled, but is in force still as much as ever. And consequently children of Beleevers being once in Covenant, they are still in Covenant. And being in Covenant, they have a right to this seale of the Covenant.

Arg. 3.
Proving some
Infants to bee
within the Co-
venant:

Because they
are holy.

Arg. 3. I passe now to a third Argument to prove children of Beleevers to be within the Covenant. I take it from that known place of the Apostle, *1 Cor. 7.* where he tells us expressly that the children of holy and beleeving parents, (I, if but one of them be a beleever) are *Holy*. [*Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy*, v. 14.

A Text which neither *Papist* nor *Anabaptist* can look upon,

upon, but it will make their eyes dazle. In this Text the *Papist* (unlesse he shut his eyes) cannot but see, that children of beleeving parents may be in a state of salvation, though they dye without *Baptisme*. Why? because they are to be accounted *holy* by birth. And in this text the *Anabaptist* (if he will not (as he said) *Quæ-
rere festucam*, seek strawes to put out his owne eyes withall, as indeed in this point they doe) cannot but see that Infants of beleeving parents are within the Covenant, and consequently have a right to the scale of the Covenant, and that because they are *holy*.

Q. *Holy*? but how *holy*? what are all the Infants of beleeving parents inwardly inherently *holy*, truly sanctified by the Grace and Spirit of Christ? and born such?

A. Not so. Herein, what ever the *Anabaptists* hold about *originall sinne*, which most of them deny, (for that is their doctrine (I will not say of all, but of many, of most of them) that, *no Infants are conceived and borne in originall sin*, (point blank to that of *David*, *Pf. 51.5.*) neither are children of wrath by nature, &c. we freely acknowledge it, that in this there is no difference. The childe of a beleever is as well conceived in sinne as any other, all being alike sinners by nature, and guilty of eternall condemnation. In this sense children of beleeving parents are not said to be *holy*. Not but that God may and sometimes doth sanctifie children from, and in the wombe, as it is said of *Jeremy* and *John the Baptist*. But that is not the *holinesse* which the Apostle there speaketh of.

What then? why an *outward, visible holinesse*. Here in the *Anabaptists* (most of them) and we agree. But

not
have
the
same
thing

Q.
How Infants
of beleeving
parents are
said to be ho-
ly.

A.
Not free from
originall sin.

But visibly ho-
ly.

Evasion.
I.
Not only with
a Civill Holi-
nesse.

what outward Holinesse is it? whether a *Civill* or *Reli-
gious* holinesse. Here is the difference. The Anabaptist
to evade the blow of this Text, taketh the former way,
understanding the Apostle there to speake only of a *Ci-
vill holinesse*, opposite to a *Civill uncleannesse*. [*Now are
your children holy.*] i.e. (say they) they are *legitimate*,
no bastards. Thus generally they construe that place.
And for countenance of that interpretation they bring
that Text of the Prophet *Malachy*, *Mal. 2. 15.* where the
Prophet tells us, that at the first, *God made but one man
and one woman*, joyning them together in marriage, viz.
that he might seeke a godly seed (or holy seed) i.e. such as
should be borne in lawfull marriage: And by that they
interpret this Text of the Apostle, [*Now are your chil-
dren holy.*] i.e. *legitimate*, lawfully begotten, not *spuri-
ous*, *no bastards*.

A.
Vide P. Mart.
& Parz. ad
loc.

To this we reply, that this interpretation (however it
must be acknowledged to have some considerable ad-
vocates for it, both ancient and moderne) yet it cannot
be the sense of the Apostle in that place. We shall not
need to spend much time about it. The error will
soone appeare if we doe but oppose the parts of the A-
postles dis-junction there one against the other. [*Else
were your children uncleane, but now they are holy.*] That
is, (say they) else were they *bastards*, but now they are
legitimate. Now the former of these is not true, viz.
that in case the unbelieving wife were not sanctified by
the believing husband, but both were unbelievers,
then their children should be *uncleane*, i.e. *Bastards*. This
is not true. For the children of *Pagans*, where both pa-
rents are *Infidels*, yet being borne in lawfull wedlocke,
they are no more bastards then the children of Christi-

ans

ans are, but are as legitimate, and as free from *civill uncleannesse* as any other.

So that (whatever sense be put upon that place of the Prophet *Malachy*) yet this cannot be the sense of the Apostle in this place, where he speaketh of a holinesse that was peculiar to *beleevers*, not common to *Infidels* as well as them. The case is cleare to them who will not heere shut their eyes against the light.

2. Others there are of them who would elude the force of that place another way. They will tell us that *Paul* in telling them their children were *holy*, he meant no more, but that they were *sanctified unto them*. Even as the *unbeleeving wife* (say they) is *sanctified to the beleeving husband*, i.e. sanctified to his use, even so, and no otherwise, are their children said to be *holy*, i.e. sanctified to the use of their parents in the duties of relation; so as the parents may both own them, and keep them, and use them as children, and that in a Christian and comfortable way.

Evasion.

2. Nor only sanctified to the use of the parents.

A. But to this it is as soone answered as to the former. (Besides that these children cannot be said to be *sanctified to both parents*, the one being an *unbeleever*, to whom *nothing is pure*, nothing holy, besides that,) There is a broad difference between being *sanctified to the use of one*, and being *holy*. To a beleever all things are sanctified. [*Every creature of God is good, for it is sanctified by the Word, and Prayer*, 1 Tim. 4.5.] [*To the pure all things are pure*, Tit. 2.15.] καθαρά, but not ἁγία, Pure, but not Holy. This cannot be said of all creatures that they should be *holy*, holy in themselves, as here it is said of the children of beleeving parents, who are said to be not only κατὰ φύσιν, but ἁγία, not onely *sanctificati*, but

A.

Tit. 1.15.

sancti, not only *sanctified* to the use of the parent, but *holy*, *holy* in themselves.

2. But what *holinesse* then is it that that the Apostle here meaneth?

But holy in
respect of fe-
derall holines.

Vid. A Lapid.
ad let. o. to la-
d. cited to the
use of the pr-
sent.

Deut. 7. 6 c. 14
2. 21.

Num. 16. 3.

A. Why, briefly; It must be a *Federall holinesse*, the holinesse of the *Covenant*. So Calvin, Beza, P. Martyr, Pareus, and almost the whole streame of Protestant Expositors carry it. As for *Papists* indeed, they here joyn hands with the *Anabaptists*. Not induring to hear of the holinesse of Children, *holinesse by birth*, because that being admitted, their absolute necessity of Baptisme, whereof they are rigid and cruell patrons, must fall to the ground. But amongst Protestant Interpreters it is generally received. And that not without good warrant from the word, which usually calleth them *holy* who are borne under a *holy Covenant*. The *Covenant* it self is *holy*, so called by *Zacharias* in that place prealleged, 1. *Luke* 7. 2. And so are they which are borne under it. Thus were the *Jewes* holy. [*Thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God.*] Ye have it often repeated in that book of *Deuteronomy*, i.e. under a *holy Covenant*. And in this respect they were all alike holy. It is that which *Corah* and his company tell *Moses* and *Aaron*. [*All the Congregation is holy every one of them.*] A truth in it selfe, though not as they intended it. They were all holy in respect of a *federall holinesse*, though not so holy as *Moses* and *Aaron* whom God had *sanctified* and set apart to speciall and peculiar services. The *Jewes* being in *Covenant* they were said to be a *holy people*, and a *holy seed*. So you have it *Ezra* 9. 2, where it is said that the *Holy seed* had mingled themselves with the people of the land. And in this sense the Apostle (speaking

king in the knowne phraſe, and language of the Scrip-
ture) calleth the children of beleeving parents holy, viz.
ſo holy as the children of the *Iewes* formerly were. This
was the priviledge of the *Iewes*; they were a *holy ſeed*,
they and their children: In that differing from *Gentiles*
that were out of Covenant. [*We* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *Gal. 2.15.*
who are Iewes by nature, and not ſinners of the Gentiles.]
the *Gentiles* being out of Covenant, their children were
borne *ſinners*, i.e. aliens and ſtrangers to the Covenant.
But it was otherwiſe with the *Iewes*; their children were
holy, borne ſuch, viz. in reſpect of a federall holineſſe.
In this priviledge doe beleeving *Gentiles* now partake
with them, (*the partition wall being now broken downe,*) *Eph. 2.14.*
they being incorporated into the ſame body with them,
being made *Burgeſſes of the ſame heavenly Jeruſalem*
with them, they ate alſo *infranchiſed* and made parta-
kers of the ſame priviledges and prerogatives that they
were. Amongſt which this is one, that *they* and their
ſeed are *holy*: that is, they are no longer *Pagans* and
Heathens, but *Chriſtians*, members of the Church, in
Covenant with God, ſo to bee taken, ſo to bee re-
puted.

Where, before we paſſe any further, take notice *The Anabap-*
how injurious the *Anabaptiſt* is unto the children of be- *tiſt injurious*
leevers, whom they bereave of this ſpirituall priviledge, *to Infants.*
this excellent Prerogative, caſting them out amongſt
the children of *Heathens* and *Infidels*: peremptorily af-
firming, That there is no difference betwixt the one and
the other: The one as *holy* as the other, the one no more
in Covenant then the other; and conſequently the one
hath no more right to the ſeal of the Covenant then the
other.

Infants of Be-
leevers and
Infidels differ.

1 Cor. 4. 7.

No difference? True, by nature we yeeld it, there is none. [*There is no difference* (saith the Apostle) *for all have sinned*, Rom. 3. 22.] I, and all have *alike* sinned; all alike guilty of *Adams* sinne by a *just imputation*, and all alike tainted and stained with *Adams* corruption by a *reall communication*. But hath Grace made no difference? [*Who maketh thee to differ from another?* (saith the Apostle.) Not *nature*, but *grace*. This made the *Jew* to differ from the *Gentile*, and the children of the one from the children of the other: And this is that makes as beleevers themselves, so their children to differ from Infidels: Of whom the Apostle saith that they are *holy*. And what? Is there yet no difference? Will our Adversaries say the same of the children of *Infidels* and *Pagans*, that they are *Holy*?

Jude 9.

But we shall not need to wonder at this, that they equalize them with the children of *Pagans* and *Infidels*, when as they doe not sticke to compare them with *Dogs* and *Cats*, boldly affirming, (so some of that way have lately done) that the one hath as much right to *Baptisme* as the other. To which blasphemy of theirs, I shall returne no other reply but that of *Michael* to the Devill, when he strove with him, *The Lord rebuke thee.*

Thus you see this first and grand Argument for the Baptisme of Infants sufficiently supported. *If Infants of beleeving parents be in Covenant, then they have right to this Seale of the Covenant: But they are in Covenant.* This we have made good by three subordinate Arguments. 1. *The Promise belongeth unto them.* 2. *If they were in Covenant under the Old Testament, then also under the New.* 3. *They are holy.*

To these many other might yet be added. That of the
Apostle

Apostle to his Romans seconds that to his Corinthians. *If the roote be holy, so are the branches, Rom. xlii. 6.* Holy parents, a holy seed. The one bring in Covenant so is the other.

Againe, if they be not in Covenant they are *without hope* (as Paul saith of unbeleeving Gentiles) there being no way whereby salvation can be obtained but by the *Covenant of free grace in Iesus Christ*. But to exclude all Infants dying in their infancie from salvation, I think is greater cruelty then the *Anabaptist* will own. Nay cleane contrary to their doctrine, who by denying *originall sinne*, (as many of them doe) put all Infants dying in their infancie into a state of salvation, (larger charity then the Scripture will maintaine) and if saved, then they must first be in Covenant.

Q. But what then (it may be said) are all Infants of beleeving parents in Covenant?

A. I answer in the *outward visible Covenant* they are. As for the Covenant it selfe, to speake properly, and strictly it depends upon Gods *election*. Neither doth it belong to any but those who are *elect*. But this is to us a secret. Now the rule is, *De occultis non iudicat Ecclesia*. [Secret things belong unto the Lord, but things revealed to us and our children.] Amongst which this is one, [I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.] And this are we to hope and believe touching all the children of believers, that they are Gods children as well as theirs, untill the contrary be some wayes manifested.

Q. But how cometh this Covenant to be transmitted from the parent to the child? what doth it run along with the blood? Is it transmitted by the way of naturall generation?

Q. Whether all Infants of beleeving parents be in Covenant. A. V.ibly they are.

Deut. 29. 29.

Q. How the Covenant is transmitted.

A.
Not by naturall generation.

P. Mart. in
1. Cor. 7. 14.

But by vertue
of the promise.

Repl.
Infants have
no right to the
Lords Supper.

A.
They have a
right to it,
though not in
it.

How the Co-
venant is made
betweene

4. Not so. This (what ever our Adversaries in this particular would fasten upon us, both Anabaptists and Papists (for in this they are agreed) we renounce and disclaime. *Fidus non transfunditur per carnem*, saith P. Martyr rightly. *The Covenant is not propagated, and transmitted by the way of naturall generation.* No. [That which is borne of the flesh, is flesh.] The parent communicates his nature and the corruption of it unto his child, but nothing of Grace. That is the free gift of God. And this it is that bringeth the childe of the believer into Covenant as well as the parent, even the free and gracious promise of God made both to the parent, and to the childe: making over the heavenly inheritance unto both as joynt heires of the Kingdome of God.

To draw to a conclusion of this first Argument. You see that Infants of believers are in Covenant, and how they come to be so. Now being in Covenant, they have right to this initiall seale of the Covenant.

Repl. But to this the Anabaptist will yet once more reply, that by the same reason they should have right to the other Sacrament as well as this, to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, that being also a seale of the Covenant.

A. To this I answer briefly. A right they have to both the seales of the Covenant, both to Baptisme and the Lords Supper. Though for the present they be not capable of the latter, yet they have a right in it, or rather a right to it. *Ius ad rem*, though not *Ius in re*. A right to it, though not in it. Even as a childe under age, an Infant lying in the cradle, being an heire, he hath right to such a house or land, which yet he cannot for the present take up, and make use of. Even such a right have the chil-

children of beleevers in, or to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, a right to it, and a right to partake of it, when they are capable of it, which for the present they are not.

Q. And why not as capable of the And Sacrament, as of the other?

A. I answer, because the one is a *passive*, the other an *active* Ordinance in reference to the receivers. *Baptisme* is a *passive Ordinance*, even as *Circumcision* was, which required nothing in the person to be actually done by him, but only to suffer the flesh of his foreskin to be cut: So in *Baptisme* now, the person baptized is a meere patient in the act of baptizing. But it is otherwise in the *Lords supper*. Even as in the *Passover* there was somewhat more required then a bare suffering, viz. a taking, and eating, &c. Even so in the *Lords supper*, the Communicant is more then a meere patient, he must be active in that Ordinance. Take and eat, take and drinke, both in remembrance of Christ. This must the Communicant do in the act of receiving. Besides, in way of preparation to it he must examine himselfe, and that as for other things, so for his abilitie to discern the *Lords body*. Which because Infants cannot do, therefore they are debarred from that Sacrament, though received to the other.

Baptisme is a *passive ordinance*, wherein the person baptized is a meere patient. Such is a man in the beginning of the new birth, the first act of conversion, a meere patient. As in *Generation*, so in *Regeneration*. Now *Baptisme*, we know, is a Sacrament of our *Regeneration*, and consequently Infants are capable of this Sacrament, though not of the other, even as Infants under the Old

Q. Infants, why not capable of both Sacraments.

A. Because the one is a Passive, the other an active Ordinance.

Testament were capable of *Circumcision* at eight dayes old, when they were not capable of eating the *Passover*, though they had a right to the one, as well as the other.

But I shall dwell no longer upon it. I passe to a second generall Argument.

Arg. 2. from Gen. 17. 12.

[He that is eight dayes old shall be circumcised.]

Arg. 2.
Infants were
circumcised,
ergo, may be
baptized.

AN Argument which I question not but it would alone bear the weight of this whole Controversie, if it were laid upon it. It is taken from the *analogie* and proportion betwixt *Baptisme* and *Circumcision*: the one a Sacrament of the Old Testament, the other of the New.

The Argument is framed thus: *Infants under the Old Testament were circumcised; therefore Infants under the New Testament may be baptized.* The Proposition or former part of this *Enthymeme*, the words which I have now read hold forth unto you, *That Infants were circumcised.* So runs the *Order* and *Injunction* here in the Text. [He that is eight dayes old, shall be circumcised.]

Wherein for the opening of the words, we may take notice of the *Ordinance* it selfe, and the *time* assigned for the administration of it. The *Ordinance*, *Circumcision*; the *time*, the *eight day*. Briefly of each.

Circumcision,
what.

Gen. 17. 13.

1. For the *Ordinance* it selfe, *Circumcision*, you know what it was. The first Sacrament of the Old Testament signifying and sealing up to the people of the Jewes their entrance into Covenant with God. Thence called by the name of the Covenant. *My Covenant shall be between you and me.* Gen. 17. 19.

For

For further opening of it; I might shew you both what was the *signe*, and what the *thing signified* by it. The outward signe, the *cutting away the foreskin of the flesh*. The thing signified by it; Generally, their *entrance into Covenant*. More particularly, their *Justification and Sanctification*. *Justification*, in the remission of all their sins, and gracious acceptation of their persons in and through the blessed seed, being now marked out for God. *Sanctification*, in the mortifying of their lusts. And hence it was, that that mark was set upon that part of the body, to represent both the *pardoning and mortifying* of all their sinfull lusts; both which were hereby not only *signified*, but *sealed up* unto them.

V. 11.

Part of the
Justification

Many other uses there were of this Sacrament. *Divers mysteries* were shadowed out and signified by it: *Divers mysteries shadowed out by Circumcision.*

As,

1. The *Corruption of their natures*, viz. That they were by carnall generation unclean, and impure, out of Covenant with God, deserving to be cut off, and cast from the presence of God, as that *foreskin* was from the presence of men.

1.

2. The *meanes of their Redemption*, viz. by the shedding of blood, *without which there is no remission, no redemption*. It is a generall observation: *All blood shed in the Old Testament, was typical*; and so was this. The blood shed in *Circumcision*, a type of the *blood of Christ* shed in his *Passion*.

2.

Heb. 9. 12.

3. The *nature of Mortification*, which is a painfull exercise making the heart bleed, and making it bleed by affliction of Spirit; and a cutting off, and casting away of sin, as in *Circumcision* there was a cutting off, and casting away the *foreskin of the flesh*.

3.

F 3

4. Their

4.

4. Their *obligation and duty*, viz. That they should be ready to *shed their blood for God*, who had taken them into Covenant with himselfe.

Ends of the
Institution.

1.

These and divers other mysticall significations it had, besides divers other *ends* of the *Institution*.

2.

As 1. It was to them the *initiall scale of the Covenant*, making them visible members of the Church.

3.

2. It was a *note of distinction*, to difference and distinguish them from all other nations and people.

4.

3. It was an *obligation* upon them, binding them to the observation of the whole Law, not only *Moral*, but *Ceremonial*.

4. It was to them a *pledge and assurance* of their right to, and interest in the earthly *Canaan*, which was the type of a heavenly. These and many more ends and uses might be reckoned up, but I shall not dwell upon them.

The time ap-
pointed for ad-
ministring of
Circumcision,
the eight day.

Pass we to the second thing, (which is here principally aimed at) viz. the Circumstance of *Time*, when this Sacrament was to be administered, and that was upon the *eight day*. [*He that is eight dayes old.*] *Filius octo dierum*, the son of eight dayes, (so the Originall hath it) i.e. a Child of eight dayes old: That was the day appointed for the administering of this Sacrament, the *eight day*: which was precisely commanded; and as precisely observed, upon what day soever it fell, I, though upon the Sabbath day. [*Moses gave you Circumcision* (saith our Saviour to the Jewes) *and ye on the Sabbath day circumcise a man;*] viz. that the Law of Circumcision might not be broken. Thus it was.

Joh. 7. 22, 23.

Q.
Why the eight
day?

2. But the question may be touching the reason of it; why God would have it so: why he chooseth out that

that time, that day? why no sooner? why no later?

A. For answer, Know we it is not good, nor safe to be too curious in our enquiries after God, in seeking a reason of all his Injunctions and Commands. He that is the *Lord of time*, may dispose of time as he pleaseth, neither is he bound to give an account of it. Yet in as much as there is a reason in all his actions, make we a sober and modest enquiry after it here.

Q. 1. *Why no sooner? Why not before the 8th day?*

A. Divers reasons I find given for it; some *Physicall* or *naturall*, others *spirituall and mysticall*:

In a *physicall way*, The Phyfitian will tell us, that the *seventh day* is a *Criticall day*, and so a dangerous day, in speciall to *Infants*; so as till that day be past, no wound, no incision can safely be made in the body of a tender Infant.

In a *mysticall way*, *Augustine* will tell us, that this had reference to the *resurrection* of Christ, who rose again the eight day, by whom we have the *true Circumcision*. The *Master of the Sentences*, and others after him, will tell us, that this *eight day* shadowed out the *last day*. *Octava dies æterna dies*, (saith *Luther*) The *eight day* an *emblem of Eternity*, which commeth not within the compasse of the seven dayes, which are the measurers of time. Then shall we have a full and perfect Circumcision, having put off this sinfull flesh.

The *Hebrew Doctors* have yet another conceit. The *eight day* was assigned (say they) to the end that a *Sabbath* (which to the Jewes was a *signe of their Sanctification*) might passe over the head of the Infant, before it was circumcised, which it doth ever in eight dayes. But I will not avouch any of these.

Q.
Why no sooner
A.

Divers reasons
alleged.
Some Physical
Perer. ad loc.
ex Plutarcho.

Other mysti-
call.

Luther ad loc.

Exod. 31.13.

More

Two reasons
insisted on.

R. 1.
The naturall
Reason.

Obs. 1.
God proportion
ons tryalls to
strength.

Psalm 103, 14.

1 Pet. 1. 6.

Phil. 2. 27.

More plainly and simply, take a double reason for it. The one naturall, the other ceremoniall and mysticall.

1. God puts off Circumcision to the *eight day*, because before that, the childe being *tender* could not without hazard or hardship indure so painfull a wound. From whence we might (by the way) take up a double observation, each usefull.

Obs. 1. See here the truth of that which St. Paul tells us, 1 Cor. 10. 13. *That God will not suffer his people to be tempted, (tried) above their strength*, above what they are able to beare. He knoweth their frames and their tempers, and he will deale with them accordingly. [*Hee knoweth our frame* (saith the Psalmist) *and he remembereth that we are but dust*. And therefore what ever sense and reason may dictate, God will deale *tenderly* with his people, the people that are in Covenant with him, not afflicting them but *when and where need is*, and in such a measure as they shall be able to beare it. Giving them such *breathings*, such *intervals*, and intermissions as hee shall see fitting for them. Thus deales he here with these *young Covenanters*, the *Hebrew Infants*, he giveth them a breathing time betwixt their *Birth* and *Circumcision*, that so they might recover the soarnesse of the one, before he put them upon a new smart. Even so tenderly is God pleased to deale with his people: He will not suffer them to have sorrow upon sorrow but where need is. *Paul* writing to his *Philippians* tells them of *Epaphroditus* his sicknesse, [*He was sicke nigh unto death*, but (saith he) *God had mercy on him, and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have sorrow upon sorrow*. Herein God dealeth with them, as the warie *Physitian* with his *patient*, who if he be driven to repeat his *Plebotomie*, his blood

ger unto children. Now the Rule is. *Necessitie and charity dispenſe with ceremoniall observances.* Such is this rite, this manner of baptizing, a *Ceremony*. Now the duties of the *Ceremoniall* Law were ever to give way to the *Morall*, and so must they still. To *preserve life* is a duty of the *Morall* Law; no Ceremony but must give way to it. He that would not have Infants circumciſed, will not have them baptized to the hazard of their lives.

A direction about the time for baptizing Infants.

2. Here is a direction to parents about the *time* for baptizing their children. Therein let them not be over haſty in thruſting their children upon this Ordinance ſo ſoone as ever they are borne, though not without ſome hazard and danger to their perſons. But let them bee content to wait *Gods time*.

Gods time, the time convenient.

Q. *Gods time*, I, but when is that?

A. When it is moſt *convenient*. That is Gods time. Therefore it was that God made choice of the *eight day* for Circumciſion, becauſe that day was moſt convenient. In *Baptiſme* now there is no ſet day appointed, it may be adminiſtred ſooner or later, before the eight day, or after. But the time convenient, that is the day.

Q. Time convenient; when is that? A. Why when the childe may ſafely and conveniently receive it, and when the Ordinance may bee had according to *Chriſts Inſtitution*. Now is the time convenient, which is Gods time; and this time Chriſtians ſhould wait for.

Children dying without Baptiſme, whether in danger.

Q. But what if the childe *dye* in the meane time? is it not hereby *damniſhed* or *endangered*?

A. To this we answer by making the like *Querie* out of the Text. What if an *Hebrew childe dyed before the eight day*? The ſame caſe of danger might have beene objected, becauſe the childe dyed without the
ſcale

seale of the Covenant: yet were not the Jews upon that pretext of *necessity* to hasten the time, to baptise before the eight day. But in this case they must leave their children unto that God who hath not tyed himself (though he hath done us) to *Ordinances* and *means*, but is able inwardly to supply what is outwardly wanting. And the like ought Christians to doe where *Baptisme* cannot bee conveniently had, with *safety* to the childe, and according to the *Ordinance of Christ*, there are they to commit and commend it unto that God, who both can and will *make good his Covenant*, though *unsealed*.

Obj. Why but it is objected: *The uncircumcised man-childe was to be cut off*: So you have it v. 14. [*The uncircumcised man-childe shall be cut off from his people.*] i. e. seperated from the fellowship of the Saints both here and hereafter. Now by proportion it may seeme there may be the like danger in a childe unbaptized.

A. To this we answer, that that Text, should it bee understood of *children*, yet is it not to be extended to *Infants* under eight dayes old. Such as dyed before they could receive this Ordinance according to the Institution, they were not within the compasse of this commination and threatning. No more are children which are taken away before they can be made partakers of Baptisme according to Christs Institution, this endangereth them not.

2. But (secondly) that place is not properly to bee understood of *Infants*, but of persons come to yeares of discretion. Not of Infants meerly *wanting* Circumcision, but of persons *neglecting* and *contemning* that Ordinance. The words in the Originall import no more. *Preputiatus mas. The uncircumcised male,* (So *Iunius*

Obj.
Gen. 17. 14.
The uncircumcised man-childe was to bee cut off.

Arg. 1.
It reached not to Infants under eight daies old.

2.
Not yet to children, but to persons of age contemning or neglecting that Ordinance.
Jun. & Trem.
con- ad loc.

conceives the word there to be taken, with reference onely to the *sexe*, not to the *age*;) Such a one shall be cut off; when? not in his *Infancie*, but afterwards, when hee cometh to yeares of discretion. If then hee shall neglect Circumcision, so approving of his parents neglect, then he shall be cut off.

That this is the sense of the place, *Iunius* maketh it good by two arguments.

Proved by two Arguments.

1. From the word in the Originall which (saith he) is to be rendered not *passively*, (as our Translation readeth it) [*Whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised:*] but *actively*, [*Who shall not circumcise his foreskin*] Not *Circumcidesur*, but *Circumciderit*. Not, shall not be *Circumcised*, but shall not *Circumcise*, or cause to be circumcised the foreskin of his flesh, *viz.* when he is come to yeares of discretion, If then he shall contemne or neglect this Ordinance, &c.

2. From the *Reason* which God himself there giveth why the uncircumcised person should be cut off, *viz.* *Because he hath broken my Covenant. Iritum fecit fœdus meum. He hath made void my Covenant.* Now this is not incident to children. And therefore the punishment should not be inflicted where the offence could not be committed. If the Infant were not circumcised, it was the *Parents* fault in omitting it, not the *Infants* in wanting it. And in this case the Parent might be cut off, not the Child. The truth whereof we see in *Moses*, his child being uncircumcised, the Lord proceeds not against the childe, but him.

Exod. 4. 24. 101

And surely thus standeth the case in *Baptisme*: If per-

sons being come to yeares of discretion shall remaine

unbaptized, either *contemning* or *neglecting* of this Or-

dinace of God, in this case God threatens them with a

Cutting

Cutting off. But as for *Infants*, let their *Parents* look to it: If there be any default, any contempt, any neglect in them, let them see to it; God will have a controversy with them they may smart for it. But as for *Infants* themselves, I have more charity then to feare their miscarriage for their *Parents* neglect. No: *As the father shall not beare the iniquity of the son*, so neither shall the *son beare the iniquity of the father. The soule that sinneth that shall dye.* The uncircumcised male should be cut off: *Non Infans, sed adultus*: not being an *Infant*, but being come to yeares of understanding.

It is not the want, but the neglect, the contempt of an Ordinance, that is dangerous and damnable. Not the want of *Circumcision*, nor yet the want of *Baptisme*, where it cannot be had according to the Institution of *Christ*. This is our rule, which we may not transgresse upon any pretence whatever. (*Better no Ordinance, then to corrupt an Ordinance.*) The *Israelites* might not upon any pretext or opinion of necessity hasten the circumcising of their *Children* before the time appointed, the *eight day*. This was the time convenient. There was the *naturall* reason of this Institution.

R. 2. Besides this, I told you of a *Ceremoniall Reason*: *Infants* were not to be circumcised before the *eight day*: Why? *Because till then they were counted as in their blood polluted and unclean.* So was it with the rest of the *Creatures*, being *new borne*, they were accounted *unclean* for seven dayes, the *eight day* they might be offered up unto the Lord, and not before. So you have it, *Lev. 22*. And as it was with other *Creatures*, so with mankind: For the first seven dayes the *male-childe* was accounted as *unclean*; the *eight day* it might be cir-

circumcised and so offered up unto the Lord. And what see we here?

Obs.
God will have
no communion
with impure
creatures.

Ezek. 16. 6.

Isa. 1. 16.

Appl.
Psal. 50. 16.
Let not such
meddle with
the seales of
the Covenant.

Obs. *God will have no communion with impure and unholy creatures.* There is the substance of this shadow. God is in himself a *pure* and a *holy* God; being so, he will have no communion with polluted & defiled creatures, men that are in their *blood*, the *blood of their nativity*, in whom the corruption of nature rules and reigns. Thence is that of the Prophet; *Wash ye, make ye clean &c. then come and reason with me.* Infants under the Law were first to be washed and cleansed from the blood of their nativity, their *Birth-uncleanness* before they came to receive the seale of Gods Covenant. Who ever would strike Covenant with God, or partake of the seales of his Covenant, they must be *pure* and *holy*.

Appl. O labour we all to be such, Otherwise never take the Covenant of God in our mouths. *Quid tibi?* [*What hast thou to doe to take my Covenant in thy mouth, &c. Ps. 50.*] Never boast that we are in Covenant with God; dare not to meddle with the *seales of the Covenant*, which so long as we continue in an unreformed, unsanctified state and condition, we have no right unto. The Infant during the time of the *Ceremoniall uncleanness* of it, it had no right to this seale of the Covenant, *Circumcision*. No more have you, who ever you are, so long as you lye under a *spirituall uncleanness*, not purged, and cleansed, and washed from your filthinesse, you have no right to this Ordinance of God, the *Sacrament of the Lords supper*. And therefore take you heed how you intrude upon what you have no right unto: But first get your soules *washed*; first with the *blood*, then with the *spirit* of Christ: with the blood of Christ washing away

away the *guile* of your sins unto *Iustification*; with the *spirit* of Christ washing away the *pollution* and *power* of sin unto *Sanctification*. Being thus washed, then, and not before, have you right to have communion with God, and so may comfortably partake in the meanes of your Communion, amongst which the Sacrament of the Lords supper is one, being a seale of the Covenant. And thus have I resolved unto you the first branch of this question: Why the Hebrew Infants were not to be circumcised before the eight day; *Why no sooner?*

Q. 2. The latter branch yet remaines. *Why no later?* They might not doe it before, neither might they defer it beyond that day. The Text is expresse for the one as well as the other; [*He that is eight dayes old shall be circumcised,*] i.e. upon the eight day: So you have it explained, *Lev. 12.*

Q. 2.
Why no later?

Lev. 12, 3.

Not but that in cases of necessity it might be deferred: So was it in the wilderness for forty yeares together. The reason whereof you have insinuated, *Iosh. 5.* *Their children were uncircumcised, for* (saith the Text) *Iosh. 5. 7.* *they had not circumcised them by the way.* Being in *itinerare*, every day marching and journeying from place to place, and subject to daily encounters with the Enemy, they could not conveniently be circumcised. In this case then, (the case of necessity) it might be deferred; otherwise it was to be administered precisely upon the eight day.

And why not upon the 9. 10. 20. ? why not the next moneth, the next yeare ?

A. For this I find divers reasons alledged: one *physicall* or *naturall*, the other *morall* or *mysticall*.

A.
Reasons al-
ledged.

1. In a Physicall way (say some) this was a more

1. Naturall.
con- Peter. ad loc.

convenient time then afterwards; inasmuch as afterwards the body of the Infant growing more firme and solid, his Circumcision would have been more painfull and grievous to him: Now God is not delighted in the smart and torment of his creatures, much lesse of the people that are in Covenant with him. Letting that passe:

Morall and
Mystricall Rea-
sons.

Paræus ad loc.

ie Parents
ly conso-
n.

Other Reasons yielded are *morall* or *mystricall*. Of them I find *Paræus* reckoning up three:

1. God would not have it any longer deferred, for the *consolation of the parents*; that they might have an early assurance of Gods grace and favour towards their Infants, viz. that he had received them into Covenant, and did look upon them as confederates with himselfe, and with his people.

Appl. A speciall Priviledge, and so to be accounted by all that professe the name of Christ; who ought to use all means to have the *Covenant sealed up*, as to themselves, so to their Children, not omitting the first opportunity that God offereth them for that purpose. Were it a temporall estate, an inheritance that were to be settled upon posterity, and to be confirmed by some Decree in *Chancery* under Seale, in this case a carefull and provident parent would not let slip the first *sealing day*. No more should Christian parents willingly baulk the first opportunity for the sealing up of the *Covenant of Grace*, and therein of the heavenly inheritance, unto their children. The sooner it is done, the more comfortable to the parent.

or the Or-
dinance sake,
it might
sleigh-

2. As God did this for the Parents, so for the *Ordinances* sake, viz. that that might not be *sleighsed*, might not be *neglected*. Had there been a liberty left for parents

rents to have deferred and put off the circumcising of their children so long as they pleased, the Ordinance by this meanes would have been brought into contempt, and have been reputed as unnecessary, as needlesse. Now *God cannot endure that any ordinance of his should fall into disrespect and disrepute among his people.* Be it *Word*, be it *Sacrament*, be it *Prayer*. &c. God would have the due estimation of them all maintained.

Applic. *And take we heed how any of us have a hand in impairing it.* How any of us be any occasion of laying any ordinance of God under disrepute and disesteem. This is done to the *Word*, when men come to heare it, as if they cared not whether they came or no: Come sometimes (it may be) for fashions sake, if they like the person of the Preacher; otherwise their own house, or their neighbours house, is as good to them as *Gods house*, the Publike Congregation. When they doe come, yet they care not how late they come, when the Sermon is begun, halfe done. Thus is it with some, who suffer every sleight occasion to detain them, As we see it too ordinary in divers cases, and particularly in that which I cannot but touch upon, your *Baptizings*, where *civill ceremony*, and outward solemnity stealeth away the time from *Religious service*: And what is this but to bring a disrepute, a disrespect upon this ordinance of God? as if it were not a thing of any such necessity as it is pretended to be.

The like I may say of *Baptisme*, when children are detained from it week after week, moneth after moneth. What doth this imply, but that *Baptisme* surely either is not proper for *Infants*, or at least it is not of any such necessity, but that they may be well enough without it?

H

And

Take heed of
sleighting Or-
dinances.

Word.

Baptisme.

The Lords
Supper.

And so for the *Lords supper*. When Christians upon slight grounds shall absent themselves, laying aside that ordinance; not comming to the Sacrament yeare after yeare: What is this but to bring a disesteem upon that ordinance? as if it were not of any such *worth*, of any such *necessity* as it is pretended to be.

In the feare of God every of us take we heed of every of these, or the like. Take heed how we be any occasion of bringing an evill report upon any of the wayes of God: But by all meanes be carefull to uphold the reverence and estimation that is due to his ordinances. This was one end why God would not have Circumcision deferred beyond the *eight day*, that he might preserve that ordinance from *neglect* and *contempt*.

3.
To order the
administrati-
on of Baptism
afterwards.

3. A third Reason alledged by my Author, is: This God did (saith he) not without a reference and respect unto *Baptisme* under the New Testament, which was to succeed in the room and place of *Circumcision*. Herein taking order also for the *administration of the Sacrament*, viz. that it should be administred unto Infants, though not precisely upon the *eight day* (that was Ceremoniall, and being so, it is ceased as touching any obligation) yet in time fitting and convenient. That was the *substance* and *morality* of that command, and that still abides; By vertoe whereof *Infants* in their infancie both may, and ought to be baptized. And so I am fallen upon the later part of the Enthymeme.

The Confe-
quence of the
Argument
proved.

Infants under the Old Testament were circumcised: [Therefore under the New Testament they may and ought to be baptized.] But how prove you this Consequence, (saith the *Anabaptist*)

4. Why

A. Why, the ground of it is this: Because *Baptisme* succeeds and commeth in the room and place of *Circumcision*, answering to it.

Baptisme succeeds Circumcision.

Q. How prove we that?

A. From the Apostle himself, *Col. 2. 11, 12. In whom also ye are circumcised, &c. v. 11. Buried with him in Baptisme, v. 12.* *Col. 2. 11, 12. explained.*

For the opening of which Text, know we briefly what the Apostles scope and drift there is, viz. to prove against the Jewes that *Circumcision* is not now necessary nor usefull unto Christians under the Gospel. The reason he giveth for it, is, because Christians have a more excellent *Circumcision* then that of *Moses*. That you have, *v. 11.* proved and made good by three Arguments. 1. From the Author of their Circumcision; Not *Moses*, who was but a servant, nor any other man, but *Christ* himselfe. [*In (or by) whom ye are circumcised: [By the circumcision of Christ.]* 2. From the kind of it. It was not an outward, but an inward circumcision, *μετὰ τῆς χειρὸς*; a circumcision not made with hands, as that *Mosaicall* circumcision was; but made without hands; viz. the circumcision of the heart, of the inward man by the spirit of *Christ*. 3. From the fruit and effect of it, which is far different from that *Legall* circumcision. There was only the cutting off of one small part of the body, the *foreskin of the flesh*: but here is a cutting or putting off the whole body of sin: [*In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ.*]

Why but the Jewes here might object: This Reason is of no force; that because Christians were spiritually circumcised, therefore they should not need the outward

circumcision: For so was *Abraham*, and yet he received the outward circumcision; He had the *inward grace*, and yet he received the *outward signe*. And thus Christians, though they be made partakers of this great benefit by Christ, yet they may stand in need of an outward *seale* to assure them of their partaking herein.

To this the Apostle answers, *v. 12.* shewing that Christ hath not left his people under the New Testament destitute of such an outward *signe* and *seale*: For hoever Circumcision be taken away, yet there is another Sacrament substituted and appointed in the room and place of it, a more excellent and *lively Sacrament* then ever Circumcision was, a Sacrament resembling it, and answering to it, viz. *Baptisme*. [*Buried with him in Baptisme*] viz. Sacramentally, Baptisme being a *Sacrament of Regeneration*, signifying and sealing up both our *mortification*, and *vivification*. [*Being buried with him in (or by) Baptisme; wherein also ye are risen with him.*] Thus then Baptisme succeeds Circumcision, and supplies the place of it.

Q.
Whether Circumcision was a type of Baptisme.

2. What then (saith the Anabaptist) was Circumcision a type of Baptisme? That cannot be (saith one of them) for then one Type might type out another, and so be a *Type of a Type*.

A.
Not so, yet Baptisme succeedeth it, and answereth to it

4. To this we answer, that we doe not say that Circumcision properly was a *type* of Baptisme: Both Circumcision and Baptisme are types of one and the same thing, viz. the mystery of our Regeneration, which is the truth of those types. But this we say, that the one succeeded the other; Baptisme succeeded Circumcision, came in the room and place of it, withall *answering* to it, and so may be called an *antitype* to it. This we say with

Baptisme an Antitype to Circumcision.

with warrant from *S. Peter*, who saith the same of *Baptisme*, and the *Ark* wherein *Noah* was saved, *1 Pet. 3.* [The like figure whereunto even *Baptisme* doth now save us.] The like figure, ἀντιτυπον, the *antitype*, i. e. *Typus correspondens*, (as *Beza* explaineth it) a *Type* answering to a *Type*. That *deliverance* in and from the *flood*, and our *Baptisme*, they are two severall types, both typifying and shadowing out one and the same thing, viz. *our deliverance by Christ*: but that being the former type, carried with it a resemblance of this; and this coming after, answereth unto that. Even so may we say of *Circumcision* and *Baptisme*: *Baptisme* is to *Circumcision* ἀντιτυπον, an *antitype*, though not properly typified by it, yet a type coming in the place of it, and answering to it.

Obj. Answering to it? (saith the Anabaptist) True, in some things it doth, but not in all: Nay in many things there is a vast difference betwixt them. And therefore (say they) to reason from *Circumcision* to *Baptisme*, can be no convincing Argument.

A. In way of reply to this, it will be both expedient and necessary to bring the Type and the Antitype, *Baptisme* and *Circumcision*, (as I may say) face to face, to compare the one with the other, that so we may see both wherein they differ, and wherein they agree. We will begin with the former.

Wherein they differ. That there are differences betwixt them, we yield it: But yet these differences we shall find for the most part *circumstantiall*; For *substance* we shall still find them one and the same. The differences are many.

1. They differ in the outward ceremony or *signe*; 1. In outward which Ceremony.

which in the one, was a *cutting off the foreskin of the flesh*; in the other, the *washing of the body with water*.

2. In some circumstances about the subject.

Gen. 17. 9.

2. In some circumstances about the *subject*, As 1. Circumcision was to be administred only to the *males*, Baptisme to *male and female*. 2. Circumcision was enjoined only to *Abrahams* posterity, to his seed according to the flesh. As for others, however they might come in and joyn themselves with *Abraham*, and be confederates with him, yet were they not enjoined to be circumcised: The command reached only to *Abraham and his seed*. But Baptisme, that extendeth to all, both *Jewes and Gentiles*. [*Go teach all nations baptizing them.*] i.e. not administring Baptisme to the *Jewes* only, as Circumcision was, but to all nations, *Jewes and Gentiles*.

3. Time of administration.

3. In the circumstance of *Time* appointed for their administration. Circumcision was to be administred precisely upon the *eight day*, neither *sooner*, nor *later*, (as I have shewed you:) But in Baptisme there is a liberty left; no set day appointed.

4. Manner of signification.

4. In their *manner of signification*. Circumcision looked at Christ to come; Baptisme, at Christ already come: The one signifying and sealing the remission of sins by and through the blood of Christ to be shed; the other, through that blood already shed.

5. Matter sealed.

Gen. 17. 8.

5. In the *matter sealed*. Circumcision sealed up unto *Abraham* and his seed a *temporall promise*, viz. touching the *Land of Canaan*: So you have it, v. 8. of this Chap. [*I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a stranger, all the Land of Canaan.*] Not that this was the *only* thing which Circumcision sealed up, (as the Anabaptists would have it) or yet the

main

main thing; For in the verse foregoing, God promi-
seth Abraham to be his God, and the God of his seed. This
was the *grand promise*, the main of the Covenant which
Circumcision sealed up. As for that *temporall inheri-
tance*, it was but an *accessary*, an *appendix*, an *additament*.
But Baptisme sealeth up only *spirituall* and *heavenly* be-
nefits, *Grace* and *Glory*.

ver. 7.

6. And lastly, (to name no more) they differ in their
duration and *continuance*. Circumcision was but a *tem-
porary ordinance*, the *temporary seale* of an *everlasting Co-
venant*, being to continue in force only till the com-
ming of Christ, in whom all the *Ceremonies* of the Old
Testament determined. Paul speaking of the whole *Pe-
dagogie* of the Law, the *Legall Covenant*, tels us, *It was
added because of Transgressions, untill the seed should come
to whom the Promise was made.*] i. e. till Christ should
come who was the end of the Law. But Baptisme, it is a
perpetuall ordinance. Such is the Gospel it selfe, an *ever-
lasting Gospel* (as it is called *Rev. 14. 6.*) And such are all
Gospel ordinances, everlasting ordinances, to continue in
force till the second comming of Christ at the end of
the world.

6. Duration,

Gen. 19. 7. 13.

Gal. 3. 19.

Rom. 10. 4.

All these differences we confesse and acknowledge:
And we think our Adversaries cannot truly assigne any
more, at least not *materiall*. Now for these *differences*,
he that looketh upon them shall see them to be but *cir-
cumstantiall*, so as for *substance* these two may still re-
maine one and the same, and so we shall find them, the
one in all materials answering the other. That will ap-
peare by comparing of them in the things wherein they
agree.

Wherein they
agree.

And here we shall find them agreeing (first) in the
main

1. In ends and
uses.

maine and principall ends and uses, for which they were instituted and ordained. As

1. Each of them a *Seale of the Covenant*. So was *Circumcision*. [It shall be a token of the Covenant between me and you.] And so is *Baptisme* a Token and Seale of the Covenant: And that of the same Covenant that *Circumcision* was, viz. the *Covenant of Grace*, sealing up to the beleever his interest in the grace and favour of God through Christ. Each a Seale of the Covenant, of the same Covenant.

1.
Each a seale of
the same Co-
venant.

Vers. 11.

Rom. 4. 11.

2.
Each an initi-
all Seale.

3.
Each a note of
distinction.

Gal. 3. 15.

4.
Each an obli-
gation to obe-
dience.

Gen. 17. 1.

2.
In their signi-
fication, sha-
dowing out
the same my-
steries.

1.
The corrupti-
on of nature.

2. Each an *Initiall Seale*, the first Seale of the Cove-
nant; each sealing up an entrance into Covenant. So
did *Circumcision*, and so doth *Baptisme*.

3. Each a *note of distinction*, to difference and distin-
guish Gods people from all other people. So did *Cir-
cumcision*; it was the *distinguishing marke*, distinguishing
betwixt *Jewes by nature*, and *sinners of the Gentiles*. And
so doth *Baptisme* now to *Christians*, distinguishing them
from *Pagans, Turkes and Infidels*.

4. Each of them an *Obligation*, binding to the same
condition, the condition of *Obedience*, & that, *Evangelical*
obedience. Such was the condition of the Covenant
which God made with *Abraham*. [*Walke before me and
be thou perfect*,] i.e. upright, or sincere. Hereunto was
he obliged by his *Circumcision*. And hereunto are
Christians obliged by their *Baptisme* to the same con-
dition. Thus they agree in their maine ends and uses.

2. We shall finde them agreeing in their significati-
on. Each shadowing out the same mysteries. As

1. The *corruption of nature*. This was shadowed out
in *Circumcision*, by *cutting off the foreskin of the flesh*.

And the same mysterie is shadowed out in *Baptisme*,
by

by the *washing of the body* with water.

2. The myſterie of our *Redemption* through the ſhedding of the blood of Chriſt. That was ſhadowed out in *Circumciſion* by the ſhedding of *blood*: And the ſame is ſhadowed out in *Baptiſme* by the *water*; both repreſenting and ſignifying the *blood of Chriſt*.

^{2.}
The myſterie
of Redempti-
on.

3. The myſterie of our *ſpiritual regeneration*. This was ſhadowed out by *Circumciſion*, wherein the cutting off the foreskin of the fleſh ſignified the mortifying of ſinfull luſts: And the ſame is ſignified in *Baptiſme*, where by the waſhing of the body with water, is ſignified the waſhing of the ſoule from the ſtaine and pollution of ſin by the ſpirit of Chriſt. Whence it is called a *Laver*, *λὺτρον παλυννενσίαι*, *The laver of Regeneration*, the *washing of the new birth*. Thus each of them holdeth forth the ſame *myſteries*.

^{3.}
The myſterie
of Regen-
eration.

Tit. 3. 5.

3. We ſhall find them agreeing in the *Subject*. Each of them being to be adminiſtred to *all*, and *only Confederates*; ſuch, all ſuch, only ſuch as are within the compaſſe of the Covenant. So was *Circumciſion* to *Abraham* and *all his poſteritie*, to *Infants* as well as others, they being alſo confederates. And even ſo is it with *Baptiſm*: it is to be adminiſtred to *all*, and *only* ſuch as may in the judgement of charity be reputed *confederates*; amongſt which *Infants* alſo are to be reckoned (as I have already proved it at large.) Upon this ground were they *circumciſed*, becauſe within the Covenant; and upon this ground they may and ought to be *baptized*.

^{3.} Agreements
in the Subject.

Repl. But to this the *Anabaptiſt* replieth, that it was not the *Covenant* that made *Infants* capable of *Circumciſion*. What then? Why, an expreſſe *Command* from God. Even that in the Text: [*He that is eight dayes old,*

Replie.
Circumciſion
was grounded
upon an ex-
preſſe com-
mand.

shall be circumcised.] Here is an expresse *Mandamus* (say they) an expresse order for the Circumcision of Infants; and by vertue hereof it was, that they were circumcised: not because they were in *Covenant*, but because God had given an expresse command concerning it.

Sol.
That command was grounded upon the Covenant.

A. To this we answer. It is true, here is an expresse command for the Circumcision of Infants: but it is with reference to the *Covenant*, which was the ground of this Injunction, and the ground of Infants circumcision. This it was that made Infants capable of Circumcision; not meerly this *Mandamus*, this Command in the Text, (as abstracting Anabaptists would have it) without reference to the *Covenant*, but their being in *Covenant*. They were *confederates* with God: God had taken them into *Covenant*, and therefore hee would have the seale of his *Covenant* set upon them. So much may be clearly collected (as from divers other passages in this Chapter, so) from the 10. 13. & 14. verses, where Circumcision is still called by the name of the *Covenant*: [*My Covenant shall be in your flesh, &c.*] Clearly importing that this was the ground of their Circumcision, even the *Covenant*, not simply the Command.

Note.

As for the Command here in the Text, it is to be noted, that it only determines the *time*, assigns the *day* upon which Infants were to be circumcised, limiting it to the *eight day*. But as for their *Circumcision* it selfe, that was ordered before, being comprehended in the *Covenant* it selfe, which was the ground of their Circumcision.

Repl.
Here is a command for Cir-

Repl. Why but (saith the *Anabaptist*) however, here is an expresse *mandamus*, an expresse order and command for

for the circumcision of Infants. Now (say they) could you shew us the like for the *baptisme* of *Infants*, then the controversie were at an end. But such *command*, such *injunction*, or direction there is none.

circumcision, not the like for baptisme of Infants.

A. To this Allegation of theirs (God willing) I shall answer more fully hereafter. For the present I shall only retort it upon them, and demand of them to shew us a *Prohibition*, or *Inhibition*, where it is any wayes forbidden that children should partake of the seale of the Covenant under the New Testament, as well as under the Old; That they who were *circumcised* then, should be *baptized* now. That *Baptisme* succeeded, and came in the roome of *Circumcision*, we have sufficiently proved it already, and I thinke our adversaries being pressed upon it, they will not, they cannot deny it. Now if it came in the place of Circumcision, then it tyeth upon our Adversaries to shew what speciall *proviso*, what *caveat* is put in to debar children from the one, who had so undoubted a right to, and so long a continued possession of the other. How they come to be cut off from this priviledge which was once so firmly intailed upon them: Which if they cannot shew, then must we still conclude it to be their right.

Sol. No prohibition to forbid the seale of the Covenant to Infants under the New Testament, more then under the Old.

As for other *alterations* wherein *Baptisme* differs from *Circumcision*, we can shew good *warrant* for them out of the Scriptures: As *viz.*

All materiall differences betwixt Circumcision and Baptisme held forth in the Word.

1. Why, whereas *Circumcision* was administred only to *males*, *Baptisme* should be administred to both *sexes*, both to *male* and *female*. For this, we have both the practise of the Apostles to warrant it, (At *Philips* preaching to the *Samaritanes*, they beleeving his doctrine, were *baptized both men and women*, *Act. 8. 11.*)

Baptizing of both sexes.

and we have the Apostles reason for it, Gal. 3. 28. [*As many of you as have beene baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; For in Christ Iesus there is neither male, nor female, &c.*]

^{2.}
Of all Nations.
2. So secondly, for baptizing of *all Nations*. Whereas *Circumcision* was restrained peculiarly to *one Nation*, *Baptisme* is to be tendred to *all*. For this we have our Saviours owne commission and warrant, [*Goe teach all Nations baptizing them;*] i.e. Not *Jewes* only, but *Gentiles* also. And we have the Apostles reason for it also in the place forenamed: [*For in Christ Iesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, &c.*]

^{3.}
Upon any day.
3. So againe for the circumstance of *time*. That we do not tye the administration of *Baptisme* to any certaine day, as it was in *Circumcision*, but administer it before the *eight day*, or after: For this also we have the Apostles warrant, who tells us that it is not for Christians now to *observe dayes* as the *Jewes* did; reckoning up this amongst those weake and beggarly *rudiments*, as he calls them. [*Ye observe months and dayes, and times and years.*] Herein Christians have a liberty, a liberty purchased for them by the blood of Christ; and that liberty they must *stand fast in*.

Gal 5. 1.
Thus in what ever other changes and alterations herein we meet with, we can still shew good warrant for it out of Scripture. Now if our Adversaries can doe the like for this great *alteration*, why *Baptisme* should not bee administered to *Infants* as well as *Circumcision* was, then indeed wee will hearken to them. In the meane time it is not for them to presse us for a speciall warrant, an expresse and particular order and command in this case. This we conceive to be altogether needlesse; having

No warrant
for this altera-
tion that In-
fants should
not be bapti-
zed as well
as Circumci-
sed.

having such a *standing order* and *direction* touching *Circumcision*, shewing us to whom this seale of the Covenant belongs, and to whom it is to be administred; *viz.* to all that are in Covenant, *Infants* as well as others, what needeth any new *order* in this particular? This *order* for the substance of it is perpetuall of force under the *New Testament* as well as under the *Old*. Further answer to this question I shall defer till hereafter, conceiving this sufficient for the present.

One allegation is yet behinde which our Adversaries by way of reply here cast in our way, I shall only touch briefly, and so dismisse this second Argument with it.

Repl. If this bee a good Argument (say they) that *Infants* may be *baptized*, because they were Circumcised, then by a like reason they should now be admitted to the *Lords Table*, because under the *Old Testament* they eat the *Passcover*. The reason (say they) is a like for both. So as if it hold in the one, why not in the other?

Replie.
By a like reason children should now eat the Lords Supper because they eat the Passcover.

Ans. To part of this I have in part answered already; give me leave now to doe it a little more fully. For *childrens eating of the Lords Supper*, whether lawfull or no, it hath beene, and yet is a Question. Anciently it is well knowne it was allowed and practised in the *Roman* and *African Churches*. Those ancient Doctors *Augustine* and *Cyprian* are Advocates in this cause, pleading not only for the lawfulnessse, but *Expediencie* of it. At this day the practice is (or at least lately was, as *Peter Martyr* informes me) retained amongst the *Græcian*, *Bohemian*, *Moravian Churches*. How warrantable this hath been, or may be, is disputable. *P. Martyr* for his

Sol.
Childrens eating of the Supper an ancient practice.

Aug. l. de Eccl. Dogm. c. 52, & Eph. 23.

Cyprian de Lapsis Serm. 5

P. Martyr Com. in 1 Cor. 11. 24.

In ista causâ
pro neutra par-
te vehementer
contenderim.
P.M. ibid.
Non enim
damnare au-
sim Ecclesiam
veterem, &c.
ibid.

1 Cor. 11. v. 24
25, 26, 28, 29.

part professeth that he will not be zealous in siding with either part in this quarrell. As for the custome of those ancient Churches in admitting them, he will not, he dare not condemne it; and as for the practise of other Churches in *debarring* them, he cannot but allow it. The latter not so warrantable is amongst us, and most of the Churches at this day, and that upon good ground (as we conceive) concluded to be the more safe, the more warrantable. For their *admission* Scripture will not beare it out. As for that place cited and made use of by those Ancients as a ground for this practice, Joh. 6. 53. *Except yee eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drinke his Blood, ye have no life in you,* it maketh nothing for it; our Saviour there speaking not of a *Sacramentall*, but a *spirituall* Communion, a Spirituall feeding upon him, which is done by *faith*, fetching refreshment & nourishment from Christ, by the application of his merits unto the soule. Much in Scripture that seemeth to make against it. *Paul* telleth us of divers *Qualifications* requisite in *Communicants*; and divers actions to be performed by them in, and about the *supper of the Lord*, which Infants are not capable of, as *viz.* (besides the *eating* and *drinking* of the *Elements* which young Infants cannot doe) the *examining* of themselves, the *discerning* of the *Lords body*, the *shewing forth* the *Lords death*, the doing what they doe *in remembrance of him* &c. All these actions are actually to be performed by worthy Communicants. So as there is just reason why Infants though they be baptized, yet they should not be admitted to the Supper of the Lord; this being as you see an *active Ordinance*, consisting mostly in doing, [*Do this as oft as you eat it, &c.*]

2. But

Q. But what say we then to the Argument? Infants eat the *Passover*, why not then the *Lords Supper*, as well as be *baptized*, because they were *circumcised*?

A. 1. To this we answer (i.) should it be granted that Infants did partake of the one, yet we see good reason why they should not be admitted to the other, being not subjects capable of the aforesaid *Qualifications*.

2. But (secondly) how can it be proved that Infants did eat the *Passover*? I know it is an opinion that hath been received (swallowed downe I suppose without chewing, as many other of this nature have been) and that by some of note; but upon what ground, I know not: Scripture I am sure will not make it out. True, we finde an *order* that there should be a *Lambe for a house*, and in case that one family were too little to eat it up, the next family was to be joyned to it; *they must take it according to the number of the soules*, (saith the Text) reckoning (say the Hebrewes) ten to a *Lambe*: But that must be understood not universally of all the persons in a family, but only such as were meet to eat thereof. Amongst which (say the Hebrewes) *sicke persons and young children* were not to be reckoned, (no more then persons *uncircumcised* and *uncleane*) being not fit to eat thereof.

Children did not eat the *Passover*.

Aret. Censura contra Pædobaptist.

Exod. 12.3.4.

Joseph de Bel- lo Judai. 7. c. 17.

Aynsworth Annot. ad loc.

3. Not fit to partake in the outward elements: This could not young Infants doe, eat the *flesh* and *unleavened bread*, much lesse that unpleasing *salade* of *sowre or bitter hearbes* which was to be eaten with it. These were no fit food for Infants.

Exod. 12.8.

4. Much lesse (in the second place) could they understand the *mystery* and meaning thereof, which (as it seemeth)

Bucan. de Bap-
tism. sect 36.

E 10 d. 12. 26.

Aynsworth ib.

The Argu-
ment retorted.

Bucan. de Bap-
tismo loc. 47.

q. 36.

Tilen. de Bap-
tismo Disp.
2 Thes. 24.

seemeth) they ought to doe, before they were admit-
ted to communicate therein. So much (at least with
great probability) is collected from the 26. v. of that
Chapter, where it is said, *It shall come to passe when your
children shall say unto you, What mean you by this service?
Yee shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lords Passeeover, &c.*
So it seemeth that none were to partake of this Sacra-
ment, but such as were of age and capacity to interro-
gate concerning the meaning of it: And that they were
to be instructed concerning it, before such time as they
were admitted to it. So much the *Jewish Doctors* will
tell us concerning this *Feast*, viz. That *such children as
were able to goe up with their parents from the Gates of Je-
rusalem to the Temple, they were to appeare before the Lord,
that being first catechized in the Commandements, they
might celebrate the Feast.*

So that this Argument may now be retorted, and re-
turned with great advantage against the Adversarie, (as
I finde it by some of our moderne Divines.) *Infants
under the Law were circumcised the eight day, but not ad-
mitted to the eating of the Passeeover, untill they were of ca-
pacity to understand the mystery and meaning of it. Even
so now under the Gospel, Infants of believing parents may
and ought to be baptized, but not admitted to the Sacrament
of the Lords Supper, untill they be able to understand the
mystery and meaning of that Sacrament, to discern the
Lords Body.* Which parallell being duly weighed, it
maketh very much for the clearing of the warrantable-
nesse of the Churches practise in both these particulars,
both in *administring* unto Infants the one Sacrament,
and in *with-holding* from them the other. But I will no
longer dwell upon it.

Objections



Objections Answered.

MAny other *Arguments* might yet be produced for the vindicating of this *cause*, but I will not overload it, or tire your patience. Probably we shall yet meet with some more in returning *Answer* to the *Objections* of the Adversary. That is the second *Act* which I propounded to my selfe, and promised to you, when I first undertooke this *Subject*. Let me discharge my selfe of it with as much brevity as conveniently I may; not reckoning up all the *shadows* of *Arguments* that are made use of, of which there are divers not worth the *naming* much lesse the *answering*, but only some of the chiefe and principall which may seem to carry the greatest shew of strength and reason with them.

Arg. 1. In the first place, against the *Baptisme of Infants*, it is alleadged, that it is but a *humane*, and that a *novel invention*, a meere *device of Antichrist*, and that of a very late *impreſſion*, not practised in the Church till at least a *thousand* yeares after Christ; first brought in by *Pope * Innocent*. Thus it is confidently charged by some, who blush not to bring in *M. Luther* to vouch this their bold assertion.

A. But herein how *grossely* (if not *wilfully*) ignorant they are, it is but too apparent. Certainly they who in good

Obj. 1.
Pædobaptism
a humane, An-
tichristian, no-
vell invention.

* Innocentius
3. qui vivit An.
1215.

A. R. In his
vanity of chil-
dren baptisme.

Sol.

Grosse or wil-
full ignorance.

Pag. 72. 73.
* Cyprianus
floruit Anno
Dom. 250.

Antiquity
pleading for
Pædobaptism.

Aug. Epl. 28. 1.
3. de Pec. Me-
rit. & Remiss.
c. 6. 7. 8. 9. ubi
totam ferè Cy-
priani Episto-
lam recitat. &
alibi passim:
vide Pamel.
Annot. in Cy-
prian. Ep. 69.
Cyprianus
Epist. 69.
Orig. in Levi.
Hom. 8. in Lu.
in Epist. ad
Rom. c. 6.

Cyrill. Hieros.
Catech. myst.
Greg. Naz.
Orat. 3. in San-
ctum lavacrum
Ambros. in
Luc. Concil.
Mile. can. 2.
citat. per Pam.
in Annot. super
Epistol. Cypri.

good earnest charge *Pædobaptisme* with novelty, shew themselves to be little scene in antiquity. I told you heretofore that in *Augustines*, nay in * *Cyprians* time (who lived in the third Centurie, within lesse then three hundred yeares after Christ) Children were admitted to the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper*: Surely then much more to *Baptisme*, without which they were not capable of the *Eucharist*, no more then an *uncircumcised* person was of the *Passover*. In this cause the testimony of those Ancients are commonly cited. *Augustine* speaking of *Infants baptisme* calleth it a *Common custome of the Church*; shewing that it was universally received in his time. *Cyprian* in an Epistle sent from himselfe, and divers other Presbyters, his Collegues met together in a Councell to the number of sixty six, to his friend *Fidus*, pleads for it, averring and proving that it was not necessary that *Baptisme* should be deferred till the eight day as *Circumcision* was. To the same purpose *Origen* before them (who lived in the beginning of the third Centurie, not much above two hundred yeares after Christ) mentioneth this as a *received custome in the Church*, approving of it, and giving a reason for it, viz. because even *Infants* are not free from *spirituall pollution* and *uncleanenesse*, no though they have lived but one day upon earth. So that this cannot be justly charged with novelty that hath these, and many more of the Ancients speaking of it, and for it.

Obj. Why but *Tertullian*, who was as ancient as any of them, the first Writer of note of the Latin Church, he was of another minde, disallowing and condemning this practice.

To this it is answered by *P. Martyr*, that so hee did

did some other things, which yet the word hath not condemned, as viz. *second marriages, &c.* so as his authority in this case is not so much to be regarded, he being then (when hee wrote that booke) fallen from the Church, and from the orthodox faith (fallen into *Montanisme*) specially seeing he denyed *Baptisme* not only to *Infants*, but to all others untill they were well stricken in yeares, viz. to *young men*, nay to *young widowes*: But even from him (as the foresaid Authour observes) it may be collected that *baptisme* of *Infants* was then in use in the Church, otherwise he would never have reprehended the practice of it. So it was, and before his time. So much is testified by some of the Greek Fathers who were before him, viz. *Irenæus* and *Iustine Martyr* (who lived in the second Centurie, about an hundred and fifty yeares after Christ) both making mention of it.

Tertull lib. de Baptismo. P. Martyr. loc. Com. claf. 4. lo. 8. & 5.

Repl. But it is replied that though it be acknowledged to bee *ancient*, yet still is it a *humane invention*, no *divine Apostolicall Ordinance*, but a meer *Ecclesiasticall constitution*. So saith the *Papist*, and so saith the *Anabaptist*, in this not unlike *Sampsons foxes*, joyned together by the *tayles*, whilst their *heads* looke severall wayes, both asserting the same position though to different ends, the one to establish *humane traditions*, the other to undermine a *divine Ordinance*. But how prove they what they say? Why the Authours prealledged some of them say as much in expresse words. *Origen* calleth it a *Ceremony*, or *Tradition of the Church*. *Augustine*, a *custome of the Church*.

Irenæus contra hæretic. l. 2. c. 39. Just. mart. quæ. 56. cum aliis citat. per Pamel. ubi supra.

Repl. Pædobaptisme an Ecclesiasticall constitution.

A. To grant all, what advantage can hence be taken? *Baptisme* of *Infants* is a *Ceremony*. Why, so in a large & yet proper acceptation of the word may all *Religious*

Sol. Pædobaptisme how called a Ceremony.

ligious Rites be called, not only of humane but *divine institution*. Thus not only the *Sacrifices*, but the *Sacraments* under the Old Testament were *Ceremonies*. And so may the Sacraments of the New Testament, *Baptisme* and the *Supper of the Lord* be called, and that without any offence to those who understand the language of the

**Ceremonia*, *Ancients*, or the proper signification of the * word.

Cere Italiz oppido, ubi sacra Romanorum tempore tumultus Gallici summa circa reservata erant, Liv. l. 5.

Repl. But it is called a *Tradition*.

A. So are some *Apostolicall institutions*, and *doctrines* and that by the Apostle himselfe.

Repl. Why, but it is called a *Ceremony and Tradition of the Church*.

How a Tradition.

1 Cor. 11. 2.

2 Thes. 2. 15.

How a Ceremony and tradition of the Church.

Origen in Ep. ad Rom. l. 5.

August. contra

Donat. l. 4 c. 24

& de Gen. ad

lit. l. 10. c. 23.

Parente Pamelio ubi supra.

A. True, but how? not of the Church as the *Author*, but as the *Subject* of it. A *Ceremony*, a *Rite* religiously observed by the Church, and a *Tradition* delivered to the Church, viz. from the Apostles themselves. So much the forenamed Doctors doe expressly aver. So saith *Origen*, so saith *Augustine*. *The Church received this Tradition of baptizing of Infants from the Apostles*. And *Augustines* rule is a reason for it little lesse then demonstrative; *Quod universa tenet Ecclesia, &c.* That which is universally received and practised by the Church, and had not its first institution from some *Council*, but hath beene ever retained, may well be believed to be an *Apostolicall Tradition*.]

Repl.

Pope Higinus the author of it.

Repl. But say some the more learned Anabaptists (at least pretenders to it) though this be ancient, and a very ancient custome, yet the pedigree of it doth not arise so high as to claime kindred of the Apostles. The first father of it was a *Bishop of Rome*, *Pope Higinus* by name.

Sol.

A. If so, then by their owne confession it commeth some.

somewhat near to the Apostles times; this *Higinus* being the eight *Bishop of Rome*, living in the dayes of the Emperour *Antoninus Pius*, about a hundred and forty years after Christ. Euseb. l. 4. c. 9.

2. But (in the second place) let *P. Martyr* in this returne them answer, that upon search he findeth no such thing in the *Decretals*. Onely this he findes, that that Bishop was the first that made a law concerning *God-fathers* and *Godmothers* (as we call them) in *Baptisme*. P. Mart. loc. com Claf. 4. lo 8. lect. 5.

(An *Ecclesiasticall constitution*, though not *necessary*, yet in the judgement of that great Divine, and divers others, both *lawfull* and *profitable*.) Hereof that Bishop is supposed to be the Author. What then? shall it be thence collected that he was the first author of *Infants baptisme*. Utile sane Institutum. P. M. ibid. Vide Bucan. de Baptismo, loc. 48. q. 47.

Nay rather (as *P. Martyr* observes) in as much as hee made such a provision for Infants that were to be baptised, appointing them some to be guardians unto them in their pupillage, who should by solemne promise be engaged to take care of them, either instead of their parents, or together with them, for their religious education in that *Faith* whereinto they were baptized, it is most probable that the baptizing of them was a thing in use before, and so no other but an *Apostolicall Ordinance* by them ordained, and from them transmitted to the Church, where the practice of it hath been uninterruptedly continued ever since.

Arg. 2. But (saith the Anabaptist) this is strange, that this should be conceived to be Apostolicall, and of *divine authority*, when as we have neither *precept* nor *president* for it in all the New Testament. Here is their great and common argument, wherewith they shake and disquiet the mindes of many conscientious and simple

Arg. 2.
No precept or president for Pædobaptism in the New Testament.

hearted Christians, who desire to see (what all Christians ought to doe) *the pillar of fire*, the light of the *word* going before them for their direction and warrant, in what ever they doe in or about any Ordinance of God. Give me leave therefore to joyn issue with them about it.

Sol.
Not necessary
that there
should be any
expresse pre-
cept or presi-
dent in the
New Testa-
ment.

A. 1. Minding them (in the first place) that it is not *necessary* that there should be any expresse either *precept* or *president* for this practice in the *New Testament*. Let it be demanded of them, what expresse *precept* do they finde there for the observation of a *Christian Sabbath*? what either *precept* or *president* doe they meet with for *womens receiving of the Lords Supper*? yet both are agreed upon, that they may be done, ought to be done. And the like wee may say for the *baptisme of Infants*, should it be granted (as indeed it must) that there is no *expresse syllabicall* either *command* or *example* in the *New Testament* for it, yet it is warrantable. How so? In as much as it findeth so cleare a ground, so firme a bottome in the *Old Testament*. Even as it is in those two other particulars. The *observation of a Sabbath*, though it hath no expresse command in the *New Testament*, yet it hath one in the *Old*, *viz.* in the *fourth Commandement*, which for the substance of it is *morall*, and so unrepealeable, of perpetuall observation. For *womens receiving of the Lords Supper*, though we finde neither command nor example for it in the *New Testament*, yet we finde that in the *Old* which will bear it out, *viz.* their *eating of the Passeover* to which this Sacrament answereth. Even so is it in the *baptisme of Infants*, though the *New Testament* be silent in it, yet the *Old Testament* holdeth it forth clearly enough, *viz.* in the *Sacrament*
of

of Circumcision, to which Baptisme answereth. There we have both *precept* and *example*, and those so clear and expresse, as that it is not necessary that we should have them renewed againe in the *New Testament*.

A. 2. But (in the second place) come we to see what the *New Testament* will afford us as touching each of these; it for *precept*, then for *president*. In both wee shall finde that the Spirit of God hath not left us so naked, so destitute as they imagine.

A. 2.
The New Testament hath not left us wholly destitute of either.

1. For *precept*. Though we have not any expresse *litterall command*, or particular direction concerning the baptizing of *Infants*, yet we have an *implicite*, & a generall one, which comprehendeth, & taketh them in. This you shall finde in that knowne place *Mat. 28. 19.* where our Blessed Saviour upon his last farewell to the world, renewing and enlarging his *Disciples Commission*, hee bids them, *Goe teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.*

1.
For precept.

For the cleare and right understanding of which words, we must know that we have not in them the *first institution of Baptisme*, (which must be observed against our Adversaries, who looke upon those words under that notion.) No, *Baptisme* was instituted, and administered long before both by *Iohn the Baptist*, and other of the *Disciples*. Only our Saviour here (as I said) *reneweth* and *enlargeth* to his Apostles their former *Commission*, giving unto them one particular direction touching the *subject*, the persons, whom they were in the course of their Ministry to apply themselves unto, *viz.* to *all Nations*, *i.e.* not only to the *Jewes* as formerly they had done, but to the *Gentiles* also. *Goe teach and baptize them, i.e.* Goe and doe unto them, *all* of them, as heretofore hath been done to *one* of them. *Go teach them,*

Mat. 28. 19.
explained.

Non ut hæc, nisi solos Judæos. H. Grot. Annor. in loc.

them, instruct them, *μαθητεύσατε*, Disciple them, make them Disciples; which being done, then baptize them, and theirs. Thus was it before done unto the Jewes, and to all that were *proselites* amongst them. The parents imbracing the faith of Abraham, they were circumcised with their Children also. The like course our Saviour here orders his Disciples now to take with all Nations: *Goe teach and baptize them all*. By your teaching and instructing of them labour to bring them to the knowledge and faith of Christ, to bring them into Covenant, which being done, then administer the *Seale of the Covenant* to them and theirs. Not to the Parents only: If so, certainly our Saviour would have put in a speciall caveat to interdict and forbid them the *baptizing of children*, that they should not administer the Seale of the Covenant to them, as formerly had beene accustomed amongst the Jewes.

Repl.
Teach and
baptize.

Repl. Why but (say they) there should need no such caveat, when as the very words of the *Commission* are so expressly against this practice. *Goe teach and baptize*, i.e. first teach and then baptize. So as none are capable of the one, but such as are capable of the other; none capable of *Baptisme*, but such as are capable of *Instruction*; they must first be taught, then baptized.

Sol.
How to be understood.

A. To this it is truly answered, that there can no such thing be collected out of these words. [*Goe teach all Nations, baptizing them.*] i.e. *Teach all Nations*, and *baptize all Nations*. As before was done to one Nation, so doe ye now to all. As the word was preached to the Jewes only, so doe ye now preach it to all Nations. As the *Seale of the Covenant* was administered only to that one Nation, so doe yee now administer it to all Nations.

More

More then this cannot be inferred from it.

Not that *all* must necessarily be first *instructed* before they were *baptized*. That cannot be gathered from the words there, as will easily appear by the changing but of one word in this *Commission*. Suppose the words to run thus, [*Go teach all Nations circumcising them.*] Suppose (I say) that our Saviour had given such a *Commission* to his Apostles, that whereas before *circumcision* was proper only to the *Jew*, now they should presse it upon all *Nations*, and should have delivered them their *Commission* in these words, [*Go teach all Nations circumcising them.*] would any thence inferre that therefore none should be *circumcised*, but only such as were first *instructed*, and so consequently *Infants* should not be *circumcised*. This inference (I suppose) every one will disclaime. And why not the other? *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them*, i. e. *Teach all Nations, and baptize all Nations; Teach those that are teachable, and baptize those that are baptizable.* More then this cannot be made of it. Now that *Infants* are a part, and a considerable part of a *Nation*, none will deny; and that they are *baptizable*, I have already proved. So as here we have, though not an expresse, yet an *implicit warrant and command*, which being rightly understood (what ever use the Adversary makes of it to the contrary) will be sufficient to beare out this practice.

In the second place, enquire we what *presidents*, what *examples* the *New Testament* will hold forth unto us. And here againe, (as in the former) it must be acknowledged that as for any particular persons who were baptized in their *Infancy*, we have not any left upon record; yet have we that which is *equivalent*, some *generall records*,

Note.

Presidents in the New Testament for Pedobaptism.

ords, holding forth unto us (at least with great probability) that this was the practice of the Church in the Infancie of it, even in the Apostles times. For this, see two evidences.

1.
The baptizing
of whole fa-
milies.

1. The former is that common one, not to be fleighted, *viz.* the baptizing of whole families, whereof wee finde frequent mention in Scripture. Paul telleth us of himselfe that hee baptizeth the household of Stephanas, 1 Cor. 1. 16. Lydia being converted, she was baptized and her household, Act. 16. 15. The like we read of the Tallow in the same Chapter, being converted, he was baptized (saith the Text) and all his, v. 33. Thus was this Sacrament then ordinarily administred to whole families, to whole households: Even as Circumcision was under the Old Testament. Abraham believing, and entering Covenant with God, hee and his whole family were circumcised, from the oldest to the youngest, as you have it, Gen. 17. 23. 27. And thus where the head of a family became a profelise, ordinarily he and his were circumcised. Even so under the New Testament, where the parent or head of the family embraced the faith, the whole family was baptized. Now in all these families, it cannot rationally be imagined but that there should be some Children.

Repl.

To this our Adversaries reply, that this phrase will not carry it, no more then that will prove that Infants eat the Paschever, because it is said that the whole family was to eat it, Exod. 12. 8. 4. Or that Infants have a small faith, because it is said that Crispus believed with all his house, Act. 18. 8. But this muse is soone stopped: In as much as the phrase comprehends all, and only such in the family, as are capable of the thing spoken of. Now this

I

Infants

Infants are not of either of those Acts, whether of *eating the Passover*, or of *believing*; and therefore the phrase there must be restrained to persons of riper age. But of *Baptisme* they are, as hath beene already sufficiently proved: In as much as this Sacrament being a Sacrament of *Initiation* and *Regeneration*, a Seal of our *Incision*, and ingrafting into *Christ*, is only a *passive Ordinance*, as *Circumcision* was. And therefore, when it is said that those of *Abraham's* family were *circumcised*, and those of *Stephana's* and *Lydia's*, and the *Tailours* families were *baptized*, we are to understand it of *children*, as well as any other.

To render this conjecture more probable, that *Infants* then were baptized in their *Infancie*, let it be observed and considered that wee no where finde any mention made of any children of believing parents who were baptized afterwards. An argument sufficient, if not to convince, yet to stop the mouth of the Adversaries. They presse us to shew where we read of any *children* that were baptized in their *Infancie*, and unlesse we can shew them some particular instances for it, they will not believe that any were. Now to retort this *negative argument* upon themselves; let it be demanded of them, where they finde any mention in Scripture of any children of believing parents, who were baptized when they came to years of discretion, and not before? That they were *baptized*, I presume they will not deny; and if so, let them shew *where*, and *when*. For this let all the *sacred Register* be searched, from the time that *Iohn* the *Baptist* began his Ministry, to the time that *Iohn* the *Evangelist* ended his, (which was above sixty years, during which time millions of children of believing pa-

Note.
No children
of believing
parents bapti-
zed afterwards

rents were growne up to maturity) and if in all that time they can but shew any one instance of any childe borne of a believing parent, whose Baptisme was deferred till he came to yeares of discretion, and that then he was baptized, we will then acknowledge that there is some strength in their *negative allegation*. In the mean time, having such *generall instances* of the baptizing of *whole families*, sure we are we have more reason to believe that *Infants* were comprehended, and are to be reckoned in that number, then they have any for the contrary.

2.
The Apostolical practice of confirmation.
Heb. 6. 2.

Calvin Com.
in loc.

Laying on of hands.

2. For a second evidence that this was the Apostolical practice, I will not goe far from this word in the *Text* which I have now in hand. Possibly we may finde somewhat that maketh for this practice nearer hand then we were aware of: Even in the words immediatly following, [*The doctrine of Baptismes, and [laying on of hands.]* *Εμβάπτισις ἡ χειρῶν.* *Hic locus ad Pædobaptismi approbationem facit.* (It is *Calvins* hint upon it.) *This place maketh for the baptism of Infants.* How so? To shew you now, give me leave to touch upon that clause a little. Though it be a *long*, yet I hope it will be a *usefull Parenthesis*, serviceable not only to our present, but to some other purposes of great, and speciall concernment.

[*The doctrine of Baptismes, and laying on of hands.*] What is here meant by the latter of these? I confesse it is not agreed by Expositors. To boult out the truth as neare as wee may, [*laying on of hands*] in it selfe wee know it was, and is a Ceremony; a Ceremony of very ancient use in the Church of God, and that in divers cases. To let passe the former; In the *New Testament* we meet

meet with a twofold imposition of hands : The one miraculous and extraordinary, the other ordinary. The former was practised by the Apostles, and other extraordinary persons in the Primitive times, and that in two cases : 1. In conferring of extraordinary gifts of the Spirit. Of this you may read Act. 8. 17. 18. and elsewhere. 2. In bestowing some temporall blessing, as viz. Healing of the sicke. Of this speaks St. James, Jam. 5. 14. [*Is any sick among you let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him.*] Not only pray [*for*] him, (as Beza, and the Geneva render it) but [*over*] him. *ἐπ' αὐτόν*. (saith the Originall) *super eum*, over or upon; i. e. holding their hands over, or laying them upon the sicke person. So was it frequently practised before, as by our Saviour himself, so by other of the Apostles, (as the Evangelists informe us) in healing of the sicke; working some miraculous cures upon the bodies of men, they imposed their hands upon them. In both these cases was this Ceremony then used. You may see them both together in that act of Ananias, his, Act. 9. 17. where coming unto Saul (or Paul) he put his hands on him, and said, Brother Saul, the Lord hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost.] But this was extraordinary, and consequently but temporary, to continue only so long as that miraculous power was continued to the Church; which ceasing, the Ceremony from thence forth in these cases is of no more use.

In the second place, there is another imposition of hands, which was, and is more ordinary. And that againe in two cases : In the case of Ordination, and Confirmation.

I. In case of Ordination, the ordaining of Ministers,

L 3

Church. In Ordination

In the New Testament twofold.

I.

Extraordinary and miraculous.

Mat. 9. 18.

Mar. 5. 23.

Mar. 16. 18.

Luk. 4. 40.

Act. 18. 8.

1 Tim. 4. 14.

2 Tim. 1. 6.

Tit. 1. 5.

1 Pet. 4. 10.

2 Pet. 1. 21.

1 John. 4. 14.

2 John. 1. 12.

3 John. 1. 11.

Revel. 1. 10.

1 Cor. 12. 13.

2 Cor. 1. 21.

Gal. 3. 27.

Eph. 1. 13.

Phil. 1. 19.

Col. 1. 26.

1 Thess. 1. 5.

2 Thess. 1. 10.

1 Pet. 3. 21.

2 Pet. 1. 12.

1 John. 1. 9.

2 John. 1. 12.

3 John. 1. 11.

Revel. 1. 10.

Church-officers, setting them apart to their Ministeriall office and function. This, for the greater solemnity of it, was performed with this significant Ceremony, the *laying on of hands*. Thus were the seven *Deacons* ordained, *Act. 6.6.* [*When the Apostles had prayed, they laid their hands on them, v. 6.*] Thus were *Paul* and *Barnabas* separated to the worke which God had called them (*viz.* to the exercise of their Ministry amongst the *Gentiles.*) [*When they had fasted and prayed, they (viz. the Prophets and Teachers in the Church of Antioch spoken of in the r. v.) laid their hands on them, and sent them away.*] Thus was *Timothy* himselfe ordained by *Paul*, *2 Tim. 1.6.* And thus did *Timothy* ordaine others. And thence is the whole action denominated from this Ceremony, and called a *laying on of hands* *1 Tim. 5.22.* [*Lay hands suddenly on no man,* saith *Paul* to *Timothy*, speaking of the Ordination of Ministers.

Act. 13.3.

In confirmation.

Hujus moris
sæpe mentio-
nem faciunt
veteres, vid.
Calv. Instit. l.

4.4.c.19.f.4.
Confirmation
whether an A-
postolicall or-
dinance?

Hieronymus
Lucifer.

Non inficior,
in eo non nihil
halluciori

2. Secondly, in case of *Confirmation*. So it is usually (how fildy I will not dispute) called. Let not the name prejudice any against the thing: which (without question) is of very ancient use in the Church of God. That I presume will bee granted at all hands. Neither can it be denied, there being so many of the Ancients making mention of it. But whether Apostolicall, or no: that is the Question.

I know many have looked upon it meerly as an *Ecclesiastical constitution*. Of this opinion was *Calvin* in his former time, who in his booke of *Institutions* declares his disallowance of *Romish* authority and judgement in this particular, in holding this forth for an *Apostolicall Ordinance*. But others I finde of another mind.

Calvin himselfe in his latter time; who coming

to

to write upon the words of the Text, upon second thoughts (which are the more to be regarded; *secundæ cogitationes*) hee retracts what before he had dubiously averred; affirming and that positively, and confidently, that this Ordinance was no other but Apostolicall; grounding it upon these words, [*the doctrine of Baptism, and laying on of hands.*] *Hic unus locus abunde testatur, &c.* This one place (saith he) doth abundantly testifie, that this Ceremony (viz. the Imposition of hands in confirmation) how ever in after times it was superstitiously perverted and abused (as the best Institutions are apt to degenerate into foule corruptions, yet it had its first originall from the apostles themselves.) Of this minde are divers others (as of the Ancients, so) of our moderne Divines of note, viz. Biza, Piscator, Chemnitius, Hemmingius, Vrsine, Dr. Fulk, Dr. Willet, and many others, men of singular both Learning and Piety, who all expound this Text in this sense. I know there are some few* others (whose names and memories I honour) who are of a different judgement; who being distasted with the corruption of this Ordinance as practised in the Church of Rome, and amongst our selves, and so possibly prejudiced against it, carry the Text another way, conceiving that by [*laying on of hands*] here, we are rather to understand the *totum Ministerium*, the whole Ministry of the Church, which was wont to be ordained by *Imposition of hands*. A usuall trope or metonymie (say they) one Ceremony put for the whole Service.

But to this supposition I must professe I cannot freely subscribe: In as much (i.) as I cannot looke upon this as one of the fundamentalls of Christian Religion, as these six heads here named, (and this amongst the

Hieronimum, quod Apostolicam esse observationem dicit. Calv. Inst. lib. 4. c. 19. §. 4.

Hic unus locus abunde testatur hujus ceremoniæ originem fluxisse ab Apostolis: quæ tamen postea in superstitionem versa fuit: ut mundus semper ferè ab optimis Institutis ad corruptelas degenerat.

Calv. Com. in Heb. 6. 2.

Biza Annot.

ad loc. Piscator

observ. ad loc.

Chemnitius

Exam. Concil.

Trid. de confir.

Hemin. Com.

ad loc.

Ursin. Catech.

Proleg. 2.

Dr. Fulk Annot.

in Rhem. ad lo.

Dr. Willet synops. Contr. 16

* Mr. Cartwright

Annot.

in Rhem. ad

loc. D. Ames

Bell. Enerv. de

confirm. cap. 14

rest)

Metonymia
a. Juncti Cart.
ibid.
Laying on of
hands here
cannot be un-
derstood of
Ordination.

R. 1.
Ordination
none of the
first Rudi-
ments.
Ista impositio
manuum ad
prima fidei
fundamenta
spectabat in
primitiva Ec-
clesia. Cajet ad
loc.
Fundamentū
quartum fuit
Impositio ma-
nuum: Paræus
ad loc.

R. 2.
Laying on of
hands here
hath reference
to baptisme.
Manuum Im-
positionem cū
Baptisma con-
jungit &c. Cal-
ad loc.
Gen. 7. 9. 10.

rest) are by some conceived to be, and that not without some colour from the Apostles own words, [*not laying againe the foundation &c. v. 1.*] Nor yet can I looke upon it as one of those *ταυτοχῆα* (as the Apostle hath it, v. 12. of the Chapter foregoing) those *prima elementa*, those first rudiments and principles of Christian Religion (as the Apostle calleth all these six in the 1. v. of this Chapter, [*the principles of the doctrine of Christ; τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς χριστοῦ λόγον, the word of the beginning of Christ,* the A, B, C, (as it were) of Christianity) one of those heads of Catechisme that children, novices, should bee first taught and instructed in; as part of that milk which the Apostle in the 12. v. of the Chapter foregoing tells us is fit for *Babes*. If this be milke, viz. the doctrine of Church-Discipline, Church Officers, Church-government, &c. what shall we call or count *strong meat*? Certainly (were there no other argument) the sad differences of the times about this point, and that betwixt those who are no *Babes*, but *strong men*, judicious and conscientious, learned and holy men, shew this doctrine to be nothing lesse then milke.

2. Besides (in the second place) the very putting of these two together [*Baptisme, and laying on of hands*] seemeth in *Calvins* judgement to import some reference and relation that the one should have to the other. A point that is observable how the Apostle here bringeth forth these doctrines (even as the *creatures* went into the *Arke*) by *payres*: *Repentance and Faith; Baptismes and laying on of hands; Resurrection of the dead, and eternall judgement*; each having a neare reference and relation to his *mate*. So it is in the two other *payres*: *Repentance and Faith; Resurrection and judgement*,

ment, the one relates to the other. And so it seemeth to be here, *Doctrine of Baptisme, and laying on of hands*; the latter seemeth to have a reference to the former, so as what shall we, or can we understand by it, but that ancient and universall practise of the Church, viz. *Confirmation* rightly administered and used?

Q. But what was, or is this *Confirmation*?

A. Here not to regard what the Church of Rome holdeth forth unto us concerning it, as viz. that it is a *Sacrament*; a Sacrament in some respect *superior* to Baptisme; that it is the *consummation* of Baptisme, so as without it Baptisme is *incomplete* and *imperfect*; that in and by this Sacrament the *Holy Ghost* is *conferred*, and given for *strength* and *corroboration* against spirituall enemies; that it ought to be performed with such *Ceremonies* as are in use amongst them, most of which are very *superstitious* and *ridiculous* toyes, none of them (*imposition of hands only excepted*) finding any footing in Scripture. Thus have they dealt with this *Ordinance*, even as *Achizai* sometime dealt with *David*, when having conveyed him away, she put an *Image* in his roome, with a *pillow of goats haire* for a boulder under the head of it, *1 Sam. 19. 12. 13.* Even thus (I say) have they dealt with this *Ordinance*; taking away the *Ordinance* it selfe as it was first instituted, they have substituted an *Image* in the roome of it, which they have bolstered up with *Ceremony*, and inventions of their owne (no better then *Idol* & *Superstition*) all to deceive the vulgar. So as their *confirmation* as by them used, is no more that which was first instituted, and which the word holdeth forth unto us, then that *Ship* *Argos* was the same that it was first built, when as by often repairing it had for ever a piece of the first materials,

Alexander
Nalensis &
Bonaventura
fatentur inge-
nuè Sacramen-
tum coi firma-
tionis, ut est
sacramentum,
neq; à Domi-
no, neq; ab A-
postolis insti-
tutum & dis-
pensatum fu-
isse, quia in
Scriptura non
legitur, sed po-
stèa in concilio
Meldenfi in-
ventum esse
scribunt.
Whitaker, Con-
tra Duran. lib.
sec. 61.

* Calvin, Be 23,
Chemnit. Pisc.
Pareus, ubi su-
pra.

The originall
and primitive
use of confir-
mation.

Solemnis pre-
candi ritus:
Calv. in Text.
ex August.

terials left in it. And so much is ingenuously confessed and acknowledged by some of their owne, as is obser- ved against them by our learned *Whitaker*. And there- fore to leave them, plow we with our owne Heifers, consult we with the Authors aforesaid. * Some of them will informe us, how that in the *Primitive Church* there were two sorts of *Catechumeni* (as they called them) persons that were catechiled and instructed in the prin- ciples of Christian Religion. The first sort were *Extra- nei*, such as were *without*, strangers to the *Covenant*, *Heathens*, *Infidels* by birth, borne out of the Church. Now as for these, the manner was, they were first taught and instructed in the faith, so as in their owne persons they might make an open confession of it, which accord- ingly they did before they were admitted unto *Bap- tisme*. The other were the *children of believing parents*, who being borne in the Church, and looked upon as members of it, they were baptized in their *Infancie*. Now they, not being able to make such a *confession* in their owne persons before Baptisme, when they were growne up and come to yeares of discretion, they were then *catechized* and instructed in that *faith* wherein they had bene baptized; which being done, they gave an account of that faith in the publicke congrega- tion, *ratifying* that *Covenant* which they had entered in Baptisme; and so they were admitted and receiued in *Full communion*, to further degrees of communion with the Church; as *viz.* to partake of the *Lords Supper*, &c. For the greater solemnity of which admission, and that the action might be had in more respect and reverence, it was performed with this *ceremony*, the laying on of *hands* upon the person so receiued; who was dismissed with

with a solemn benediction. This was (as it is conceived by them) the simplicity of this Ordinance in the first institution and primitive practise of it. An Ordinance (as Calvin and the forenamed Authors conceive of it) of great and singular use unto the Church of God. And surely so it would bee, were it but restored to primitive purity.

Confirmation
a usefull Ordinance to the
Church in di-
vers respects.

1. By this meanes the exercise of catechizing would be brought in use and credit, whereof the Church of God hath ever had singular need, and use.

1.
Chemnit. Co.
in Mark 10. 14

2. By this meanes the unity of the faith would bee maintained, especially there being one and the same forme of catechizing generally observed.

2.
Calv. Instit.
lib. 4. cap. 13.
Calvin ibid.

3. By this meanes parents would be quickned up to looke to the religious education of their children, which otherwise many of them never regard.

And 4. Children themselves would bee put on to seeke after knowledge, that they may be able to give an account of that faith whereinto they were baptized, when they shall be called to doe it before the publicke congregation.

5. By this meanes persons ignorant or scandalous might be kept out from communion with the Church in that sacred Ordinance of the Supper of the Lord.

In which respect, of what consequence it might be for the healing of our present breaches, may bee easily apprehended. I shall not need to tell you, what a stumbling blocke in the way of many, our mixed communion (as they call it) hath beene, and is. At this stone many have tripped, and some have fallen, and others are daily in danger of it. Now, of all remedies for the healing and preventing hereof, I know none more promising,

A soveraigne
remedy against
mixed commu-
nion.

then this Ordinance being duly practised according to the institution of it. By this means that *sacred Ordinance* might be freed and kept pure from that pollution, (so much (and that not without cause) complained of) through a promiscuous participation; and so this scandal being removed, we might hope that many who are upon this ground *departed from the unity* of the Church, at least have *broke off communion* with it, might in a little time be reduced, and brought home againe; and others who are staggering might be confirmed and established.

6. And lastly, by this meanes also that difference of the times about the *formality of a Church-Covenant* in receiving in of *members* (as they call them) would soone be compremized, and taken up: There being here the *substance* of what is there desired and contended for, and that *better bottomed* (as I conceive) then the former.

Vtinam verò
morem retine-
remus quem
apud veteres
fuisse admonui
priusquam hæc
Sacramenti
larva nascere-
tur. Calv. Inst.
de Confirm.
l. 4. c. 19. s. 13.
Talem ergo
manuum im-
positionem, A-
liquæ simplici-
ter locis bene-
dictionis sin-
glanæ, & resti-
tutam hodiè in
puram usum
velim. Calv.
Inst. l. 4. c. 19.
S. 4.

In all which regards (besides many other) for my owne part I cannot but joyne with *Calvin* and *Chemnitzius*, and divers other of our Divines, in desiring the restitution and restoring of this *Ordinance* to the Church, which through the grosse corruption of it in the Church of *Rome*, and too apparent abuse of it amongst our selves (it being generally turned into a meet formality) hath growne into great *dislike* and *distaste*. Certainly, what ever any through prejudice may think of it, were this *Ordinance* stripped of those *raies* which *superstition* hath put upon it, and restored to *naked purity* and *simplicity*, the Church of God should have no cause to bee ashamed to owne it, specially seeing the *Apostle* himselfe in the words of the Text seemeth to give such countenance to it, laying it downe for one of those *first principles*

principles concerning the nature and use whereof children should be instructed and taught.

Hodie retinenda pura institutio est: superstitio autem

corrigenenda. Calv. ad Tex. Nostri sæpè ostenderunt, ritum confirmationis remotis inuicilibus, superstitionis, & cum Scripturæ pugnantibus traditionibus, piè & ad Ecclesiæ ædificationem, juxta scripturæ consentum usurpari posse, Chem. Exam. de Confirm. Ob nugas Pontificias in pristina Evangelii reformatione totus actus confirmationis est abrogatus, quæ rescissis istis pæniis Pontificiis non malè retineri potuisset. Chemnit. Harm. in Mark. 10. 16.

2. But all this while, what is this to the purpose in hand? what maketh this for *Pædobaptisme*, the *baptisme of Infants*?

Confirmation presupposeth Pædobaptisme

A. Surely yes, very much. This being granted that there was such an *Ordinance* in use in the Apostles times practised after the manner that you have heard, it may from thence be *demonstratively* inferred, that some children were then baptized in their *Infancy*. To what purpose else should this subsequent act serve? wherefore should there be such a *publicke confession*, and such a *solemnne restipulation*, and ingagement after *Baptisme*, were it not that *Baptisme* was administred unto them in their *Infancy*, before they came to yeares of discretion. Otherwise, had they been able to answer for themselves, and to stipulate in their owne persons when they were baptized (as those that were *adulti* did) what need would there have beene of such a *subsequent solemnity*, to bring them *actum agere*, to doe that againe which they had once done before. But I will not dwell any longer upon it.

You see now what *Precept*, and what *Presidents* the Spirit of God in the *New Testament* will afford us for the countenancing, and bearing out of this practice, the *baptizing of Infants*. True it is, *expresse* and *particular*

they are not; not yet so *demonstrative* and *convincing*, but that the Adversary may take up some cavills against them. Yet are they such evidences as may give satisfaction to those who are willing to receive it. However, sure we are, they make more for the *warrantableness* of this practice, then ought that the Adversary can produce, will against it.

Object.
Infants are
not capable of
repentance &
faith, ergo not
of Baptisme.

Acts 2.38.

Acts 8.37.

Ans.

In persons of
yeares actuall
repentance &
faith is requi-
site before bap-
tisme, not so
in Infants.

Not so (say they) for as for *Infants* they are not subjects capable of *Baptisme*. And why not? Why, because they are not capable of those *qualifications* which should dispose them to the receiving of this Sacrament. And what are they? why, *Repentance* and *Faith*. These are the *conditions* which the Spirit of God requireth in all persons that are to bee baptized; *Repentance*. [*Repent ye therefore and be baptized*] (saith Peter to the Jewes.) *Faith* [*if thou beleevest with all thine heart, thou mayest*.] (saith Philip to the Eunuch concerning his Baptisme.)

A. To these Texts of Scripture it is soon answered, that here both *Peter* and *Philip* had to deale with persons of *yeares*, and those such as had no other title to the Covenant, but such as their owne *actuall repentance* and *faith* conferred upon them. Now had we to deale with such, we should runne the same course, not admitting them unto this Sacrament, but upon the testification of their *Repentance* and *Faith*. But in the meane time, this is ill applyed to *Infants*, the children of believing parents, who have a title to, and interest in the Covenant, and consequently a right to the *seale of the Covenant*, by vertue of their fathers *charter*.

Repl.

Repl. But it will be replied; This is a generall, *universall condition*, required of all that are to be baptized; They must first *believe*. Our Saviours owne words (say they)

they are expresse for it. [*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* Mark 16.16. So that it seemeth faith is a condition absolutely requisite in persons to be baptized, and must goe before Baptisme. Here is one of the great arguments, which the Adversarie putteth a great deale of confidence in. But what strength (or rather weaknesse) is in it, will soone appeare.

Mark 16.16.
cleared.

A. In the 1. place, it is truly answered by P. Martyr, and others, that *Ordo verborum non necessario infer ordinem rerum*, The order of words doth not necessarily infer the same order in things. For instance, Mark 1.4. it is said, [*John did baptize and preach the baptisme of Repentance.*] Here is baptizing put before preaching, (which may serve to ballance that in the last of Matth. 19. Go teach all Nations baptizing them, where teaching is put before baptizing,) yet will it not thence follow, that John baptized before he preached. So here in those words of our Saviour, believing is put before baptizing in the order of the words. Yet it will not thence follow that faith must alwayes goe before baptisme in the reality of the thing. Should wee thus precisely stand upon the order of words, what should we say to that of our Saviour, Job. 3. 5. [*Except a man be borne of water, and of the Spirit, &c.* (a Text which is brought to ballance that other) where water is put before the spirit.

Sol.
P. Mart. loc.
Com. Claf. 4.
loc. 11. sect. 13.

A. 2. In the second place, wee grant it, Faith and actuall faith is requisite in persons capable of it, before they be admitted to Baptisme. And of such & only such, is that place to be understood; [*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*] Which cannot extend unto Infants, as the latter part of the verse will sufficiently evidence. [*Hee that believeth not shall bee damned.*]

Siquis urgeat
τὸ πρῶτον, (qui-
cunque credi-
derit & bap-
tizatus fuerit)
reponemus ei,
si placet sylla-
bas numerare,
dictum Chri.
Joh. 3.
Nisi quis re-
natus fuerit ex
Aqua & Spirit.
Aret. Censura
contra Anab.

Which

Which to apply to *Infants*, and so for want of *actual* faith (which they are not capable of) to exclude them from all hopes of salvation, I presume it were greater cruelty then the *Anabaptist* will willingly owne. The place it selfe being consulted with maketh it cleare; shewing that this is spoken of *all* and *only* such as were *capable of the Gospel preached* to them, and consequently capable of *faith*; as the verse foregoing explaines it, v. 15. [*Goe yee into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.*] And what *Gospel* should they preach? Why, even this; [*He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved, &c.*] Which must be restrained to those who were capable of hearing, and receiving that Gospel; not extended to *Infants*; who though they bee not capable of *actual faith*, yet are they capable of salvation, and consequently of *Baptisme*.

Bucan. loc. c6.
loc. 48 q. 35. f. 7
Tilen. syntag.
de Baptismo
Disput. 2. f. 30.

1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100

The present
faith how a
vailable for
Infants.

This place I finde paralleld and compared with that of the Apostle to the *Thessalonians*, 2 *Thes.* 3. 10. where he giveth order that those which would not *work* should not bee *relieved*; [*We commanded you that if any man would not worke, he should not eat.*] What then shall become of *Infants*, and *sicke*, and *impotent* persons? must they be starved? Not so. That place must be restrained to such as are able to worke, but *will* not. So here, [*He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved, but hee that believeth not shall be damned.*] What then shall become of *Infants*? may they not be baptized, and so must be damned? Not so. The place is to be restrained to such persons as are capable of faith, may believe, but *will* not.

2. 3. In the third place it is answered by some; that *Infants* though they have no faith of their owne, yet

yet the *faith of their parents* may be sufficient for them. Even as the *sinne* of another (their first parent) was enough to make them *sinners*, reputed such by a *just imputation*; so the *faith* of another (of their next parents) may be enough to make them *beleevers*, reputed such by a *gracious acceptation*. Of this opinion was *Augustine* and the *ancient Church*. And not without some truth; in as much as the faith of the parent is sufficient to bring the childe within the compasse of the Covenant, and so to make it *baptizeable*. However (as *P. Martyr* states it rightly) in point of salvation, every one (who is capable of it) must be saved by his owne faith. [*The just shall live by his faith.*] Not the faith of another.

Sharp. Cursus
Theolog. de
Bap. xmo Con-
trov. 1.

Vid. P. Marr.
loc. com. claf. 4

Heb. 2. 4

Infants nec
wholly unca-
pable of faith.

De fide Infan-
tium fædera-
torum, idem
dicimus quod
de ipforum

A. 4. But (in the fourth place) it may be truly affirmed concerning *Infants* that they are not wholly *uncapable of faith*. True, of the *outward profession*, and *inward exercise* of it, they are. But not altogether of the *grace* it selfe. This, (at least the *seed* and *root* of it) may be infused and implanted in the soule even in *Infancie*, by the secret worke of the Spirit regenerating and sanctifying of it. So as though *Infants* have not faith actually, by way of manifestation or exercise; yet *virtually* they may, by way of *inchoation* and *inclination*. Thus may *Infants* have a *gracious disposition* which in time will come to be *fides formata*, formed in the *habit and act* of *faith*. A truth which is well illustrated by some by comparing *faith* and *reason* together, which *Infants*

ratione. Utraq; ipsis inest acta primo, non secundo: in semine, non in messe: in radice, non in fructu: inter a spiritus virtute, non externa operis demonstratione: Tilen. Syn. de Bapt. Disp. 2. sect. 27. Infantes quemadmodum dicuntur habere rationem, ita habere fidem dici possunt. Imò firmiori quadam ratione, quum sit Dei occulta & secreta elect. o. Arec. contr. Anabap.

N

may

92 *The Doctrine and Practice*

of their visible state, their being under the Covenant outwardly. But I hasten to a conclusion of this point. One or two *objections* more, and I have done.

Obj.
Infants not
capable of be-
nefit by Bap-
tisme.

Obj. Infants are not subjects capable of any *benefit by baptisme*, and therefore why should they be baptized?

Ans. To this I have in part answered heretofore. Let me now doe it a little more fully, yet briefly.

A. 1.
As much as by
Circumcision.

1. Demanding of the Adversaries, what benefit Infants under the Old Testament had by *Circumcision*? Let them shew mee the one, I will shew them the other.

A. 2.
Baptisme be-
neficiall to the
parents.

2. Though *Baptisme* at present should not bee beneficiall unto *Infants* themselves, yet to their *parents* it may be; serving exceedingly for their *consolation*, when they shall see their children thus marked out for God, having Gods *distinguishing marke*, his Seale set upon them; which is to them an assurance that God is not only their God, but *the God of their seed*: That he doth acknowledge them in *Covenant*, and will make good the Covenant unto theirs, in case they doe not afterwards by some act of their owne *ponere obicem*, put a bar in the way, so *nullifying the Covenant*, and frustrating Gods gracious intentions towards them. Thus it is usefull to the *parents*.

A. 3.
Baptisme be-
neficiall to
children for
the present.

3. Neither (in the third place) is it altogether *unusefull to the childe*, who by this means:

Rom. 6. 4. 5.

1. Is *distinguished* from *Heathens*, and *Infidels*, and marked out for Gods speciall service.

2. Is hereby *visibly ingrafted* into *Christ*, and acknowledged as a *visible member* of the Church: And consequently hereby commeth to have a share, and interest in the *communion of Saints*; being now daily re-
membred

membred at the Throne of Grace by all those who pray for the welfare of the Church.

3. Besides this (in the third place) who knoweth how, and in what way God may be pleased to concur, and worke together with his Ordinance? Certainly, heerein Gods wayes are (as the Apostle sayth of them)

Ανεξιχνίασι, past our finding out. And therefore stand not in this case to reason with *flesh and blood*, to consult with sense and reason about it. Had those women in the Gospel so done, surely they would never have brought their children unto Christ to be *touched* of him. But in this set *faith* on worke (as they did) and let that command *obedience*, obedience in submitting unto this Ordinance of God.

Rom. 11. 34.

4. In the 4. and last place: Though this Ordinance have not any present effect upon *Infants*, yet *afterwards* it may have: *viz.* when they shall come to apprehend this *stipulation*, and ingagement betweene God and them: then this Sacrament will be usefull unto them, as in other respects, so specially as a *strong obligation* upon them, to binde them for ever to the service of that God, who was pleased to *take them into his service*, before ever they were able to doe *him any service*: To take and acknowledge them as *his*, before they knew *themselves*: To take and seale them for his *children*, before they were capable to know their *father*. A peculiar *favour*, and so a peculiar *obligation*.

A. 4.

Baptisme beneficiall in the future.

Obj. But how shall *children afterwards know that they are made partakers of this Ordinance*? An objection which possibly may take much with some. Those who are thus baptized in their *Infancy*, how shall they know, and be assured that they are *baptized*?

Obj.

How shall Infants afterwards know that they are baptized.

Even as an Israelite knew that he was circumcised:

A. I answer; Even as the *Israelites* knew, were assured that they were *circumcised*.

Repl. Not so (saith the Adversary.) *Circumcision* was a *permanent*, *Baptisme* is a *transient* signe. The one left an impression behinde it; not so the other. The *Israelites* carried a *sensible marke* in their *flesh* to minde them of their *Circumcision*.

Viz. by the testimony of others.

The inhabitants of Colchis, the Ethiopians, the Trogloditæ, and the Egyptians. Alex ab Alex. l. 2. c. 25. Her. l. 2. Diodor. Sicul. l. 2. c. 1. It. l. 4. c. 3. Witnesses in Circumcision. Vide Goodwins Moses and Aaron. l. 6 c. 1.

A. True: Such a *sensible marke* they had. But how did they know, that that marke was given them for any such religious end, and purpose? That they received it as a *Sacrament*, a *seale of the Covenant* betwixt God and them. Other Nations there were (and that many) who used *Circumcision* (even as the *Turkes* doe at this day) but not to any such intent, not as a *Sacrament*. How did the *Israelites* know that theirs was given them with such an intent? Why, herein they were to give credit unto the testimony of others, viz. their *parents*, and other *witnesses*. Amongst whom (as it seemeth) some were specially appointed for that purpose. So much the *Jewish Doctors* will informe us of; describing to us the manner of *Circumcision*, they will tell us, that when a childe was to be circumcised, *one who supplied the place of a witness* (whom they called by the name of *Baal Berith*, and *Sandak*, that is, the *master of the Covenant*) he held the childe in his armes whilest it was circumcised, that so he might beare witness both of the *Circumcision*, and of the *name* given the childe at that time. Such was the use of the *latter Jewes*. And it seemeth that the practice was *ancient*, as ancient as the Prophet *Isaies* time. So that learned payre of *Expositours*, *Iunius* and *Tremellius* interpret that place of that Prophet, *Is. 8. 2.* where the Prophet tells us, that hee

tooke unto him faithfull * *witnesse* : viz. *Vziah the Priest, and Zachariab.*] *Witnesses* to what? Why to the *Circumcision of his Sonne*, of whom hee speaketh in the verse before and after. Such as might beare witness that he gave him that name in his Circumcision, which the Lord had appointed him : viz. *Mareshal hash baz*. Which, whether it was a thing really done, or only represented to the Prophet in a *vision*, is not materiall. It seemeth however, that this was a practise then in use in those times. And from hence (as judicious Authours with good probability conjecture) came that custome so anciently and universally received amongst the Churches (till of very late times) : viz. The having of *Godfathers* and *Godmothers* (as wee call them) in *Baptisme*. Some persons specially appointed to beare witness of the *receiving* of such a person into the Church of God by *Baptisme*, and of the *Name* then given unto him. But this by the way.

From these did children amongst the *Israelites* receive the *testimony* of their *Circumcision*. Which they were induced the more to give credit to, because they saw the same practised upon others daily. And even such a testimony have children now concerning their *Baptisme*, besides the testimony of the *whole Congregation*, which many have, and others ought to have.

Repl. But this is but a *humane testimony*, and consequently *fallible*. How shall I build my faith upon it?

A. I answer. A *Humane testimony* is sufficient to build a *Humane faith* upon. True, a *Divine faith* must have a *Divine testimony*, But to a humane faith a humane testimony may suffice. Now such is this *faith*. To beleeve that I was *Baptized*, this is but a humane

faith,

* i.e. Vires nominatim advocatos ut testarentur nomen illud filio meo impositum in Ecclesia, quum circumcideretur. Jun. & Tremel. ad loc. Vers. 1. 3.

The originall of witnesses in Baptism.

A. q. ex hoc ritu profectum esse illum nostrum constat, quo certi homines speciatim, maxime vero in calamitosis temporibus (ut ista futura erant) adhibentur testes accessus ad Christum, & ad Ecclesiam per Baptismum & nominis in Baptismo inditi. Hos vulgus compadres, et commatres, Græci olim *Συντινέες*, appellarunt. Jun. & Trib.

Repl. A humane testimony is no ground for faith.

Sol. A humane testimony sufficient for a humane faith.

faith, being concerning a matter of *humane fact*.

Repl.

What if a man should believe that he is baptized when he is not?

Sol.

Such an error being invincible shall not hinder salvation.

Repl. But what if I should be deceived herein: as it is possible I may be? thinke and believe that I was baptized, when as I was not.

A. To this I answer, that such an *error* being invincible, shall not be prejudiciall in point of salvation. In this case the *apprehension* of the thing shall be in stead of the thing it selfe. As in the case of persons dying before they can have the Sacrament of *Baptisme* administred unto them: In this case it is determined that the *desire* of *Baptisme* (*viz.* by *Parents* for their *children*, by persons of age for themselves) shall supply the want of it. So said *Ambrose* concerning the Emperour *Valentinian*, who comming to him to be baptized, dyed by the way; *He was baptized* (saith he) *in vow and desire*, though not by the washing of water; which he concluded to bee as effectuall as if he had beene made partaker of the thing it selfe. And it is no more then what the Apostle will beare him out in, who tells us, *That where there is a willing minde, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that which hee hath not.* *Desire of Baptisme*, (where it cannot be had) is *baptisme* in Gods ac-

Baptizatus vo-
to & voluntate
licet non reip-
sa per aquae
lavacrum. Am.
lib. de vita Va-
lent.
2 Cor. 8. 12.

Minime salva-
ri possunt qui
nec re, nec vo-
to baptismi
Sacramen um
susceperint: qui
vero saltem
voto Sacra-
mentum bap-
tismi suscepe-
rint, etsi non re
salvari possunt
Thom. pars 3.
q. 68. Art. 2. con-

ception, supplying the want of this Sacrament. So much even Papists (however standing much upon the *absolute necessity* of Baptisme) will yeeld. Even so here. In the case of such an *invincible error* and mistake, (which is only *possible*, not *probable*, much lesse *ordinary*) the very apprehension of the thing as done, with the application of the thing signified by it, shall be effectuall unto the person to all intents and purposes, as if he had been really made partaker of that Sacrament.

And thus have I endeavoured as briefly, and yet as fully

fully as I could, to give satisfaction to all the chiefe Arguments or Objections which are brought against this Doctrine and Practise of Baptizing of Infants.

Onely let me yet speake one word or two, to the Anabaptist properly so called. For you must know, that of this Sect (as usually in all Sects it is) there are divers sorts. Amongst other, some Catabaptists, others Anabaptists. The former opposeth the Baptisme of Infants, as a thing not meet, not lawfull, at least not expedient to be done; yet being done, he alloweth it as valid and of force. The other looking upon this Baptisme as a meer nullity, holdeth an absolute necessity of Rebaptization. Now to these latter let me speake a word, and but a word. Minding them of that old Rule, which taketh place in many cases: *Fieri quod non licet, factum valet*: A thing which ought not to be done, yet being done, it may be of force and valid. For instance. David ought not to have taken the wife of Uriah to his wife. The Lord by his Prophet chargeth it upon him, as a sinne, and a great sinne; yet being done, the Marriage was lawfull, and ought not to be dissolved. Amongst us, *Clandestine marriages* (as we call them) they are not allowable, but prohibited, yet being done, they are valid, and may not be undone. To come neerer the point in hand. In the case of Baptisme, Parents ought not to tender their children to be baptized by any *Romish Priest* in a superstitious way; yet being done, Baptisme so administred ought not to be reiterated, but to be held as true, and valid. A case stated by many of the *Antients*; in case any were baptized by *Hereticks*, so that the true matter and forme of Baptisme was observed, in this case the determination of the Church (against the opinion of

An antidote against Rebaptization.

2 Sam. 12. 9.
10.

Concil. Laod.
can. 7. Arelat.
can. 8. Leo Ep.
77. citati per
Ehemnitium
in Exam. de
Confirmat.

Cyprian) was that they were not to be *rebaptized*, only they were to be *catechised*, and interrogated concerning the faith whereinto they were baptized, and so by *imposition of hands* in confirmation, they were to be received into communion with the Church. Even so it is here. Suppose the *baptisme of Infants* not to be *regular*, that they ought not to be baptized untill they be able to understand the meaning of this Sacrament, and make a profession of the faith in their owne persons (an opinion which some moderate spirits are somewhat inclinable to) yet being baptized, their baptism is *valid*, and ought not to be repeated. Even as it is with the baptism of a *prophane* or *ignorant* person; nay suppose a *Jew*, a *Turke*, an *Infidel*, a *Pagan*. In case such a one should out of some by and sinister respect, whether to save his *life*, or procure his *liberty*, or for *lucre*, or *honour*, or the like, should tender himself to *Baptisme*: In this case he ought not to be admitted. *Divine ordinances* are *not to be prostituted* to any such base or sinister designs. Yet put the case that by *favour*, or by some other indirect way, he doe obtaine it. In this case his *baptisme* is not to be accounted a *nullity*. Neither ought he (in case afterwards he shall be *inlightened*, and come truly and seriously to imbrace the faith) to be *rebaptized*; only hee is then to make a right use of that *baptisme*, which was administred to him rightly for the *substance* of it, however by him obtained in an undue way and manner. Even so here. Supposing *Infants* to be baptized before they are *meet* to partake of that Ordinance, yet being for *substance* rightly baptized, they ought not now to be *rebaptized*, but only labour to make a right and holy use of that baptism, which was truly, though *unseasonably*

conferred upon them. Which if rightly considered, and duly weighed, I presume it might be of use to some who are not fully satisfied in the point of *Pædobaptisme*, as touching the *expediencie* or *lawfulnessse* of it, viz. to stay them from running into that dangerous and destructive error of *Anabaptisme*, properly so called, I mean of *Rebaptization*, the repeating of *baptisme*; which being once for *substance* rightly administred, ought not for some defect in the *manner*, or mistake in *circumstance* be reiterated. But thus much for this point; which I have dwelt the longer upon, if it might be, to settle wavering and unstable mindes, and to keep them from being seduced, and drawne away to the imbracing of this *spreading error* of the times, which hath also begunne to put up head in this place: However, *liberare animam*, to deliver my owne soule, by the discharge of my duty towards God and you; withall, making it manifest, that if God shall permit this *error* to spring and spread further amongst us, yet it may never be said, that these *Tares were sowne, and grew up whilest the Husbandmen slept.* Mar. 13. 25.

MARK. 10. vers. 13. to 16.

And they brought young Children unto him, that
he should touch them, &c.

YO V know what Subject it is I have lately fallen upon, viz. the *Doctrine of Baptisme*; and therein of *Pædobaptisme*, the *Baptisme of Infants*. This doctrine and practice I have already in part endeavoured to assert, and vindicate against the *Anabaptists* of the times. In further prosecution thereof I have now taken up this portion of Scripture, which is commonly made use of in this cause, as an argument to evince the warrantableness of *Childrens baptisme*.

A portion of Scripture well knowne. No one passage in the *Bible* more frequently read in our publick Congregations (so it hath been,) but very seldom explicated. So *Chemnitzius* observed it in the *Germane Churches* in his time; and the observation holdeth as true in ours. Scarce a *Lords day* but this historie hath beene read (I meane in great Congregations,) but it may bee scarce once in an age opened. Give me leave now to doe it, and I will doe it with as much brevitie as conveniently I may; intending rather to glosse upon every thing in it, then to insist upon any thing.

The words are a *historie*, consisting of three parts,

As

three

A 3. sold A 3.
in this Hist.

The Doctrine and Practice of Pædobaptisme

three sensuall acts. The first of those *devout persons* who brought and presented these children unto Christ: *v. 13.* The second of the *disciples* repelling these Infants, and rebuking those which brought them; *ibid.* The third of our Saviours rebuking his Disciples, *inviting, imbracing, and blessing* these Infants; *v. 14, 15, 16.* wee shall looke upon them severally.

1. Act.

The act of those which brought these children to Christ: wher
4. particulars.

Begin with the first, the *act* of those *devout persons* which brought these children; wherein diverse particulars offer themselves to our consideration. As 1. *who* brought them: 2. *whom* they brought: 3. *to whom* they brought them: 4. *to what end* they brought them: A word of each.

1. Who were the bringers.

I. *Who brought them;* προσέταρον (saith the text.) *They brought;*] who they were, none of the Evangelists expressed. Most probably, the *Parents*, the *Mothers* of these children. They brought them, which they did out of a tender and *motherly affection* which they bare unto their children; desiring their good, their welfare, [*they brought them.*]

2. Whom they brought viz. Infants.

II. And *whom* did they bring? *Children*, τὰ παῖδια, (saith our Evangelist:) *pueros, puerulos, children, young children.* So our translation renders it, and such they were. Not children grown up, as some of the *Anabaptists* would willingly have it, but Infants.

Cleared by arguments. Luk. 18. 15.

1. So St *Luke* expressly calleth them; *βρέφη*. Infants, sucking children.

2. So much also is implied in the first word of the text, *they brought*, προσέταρον, *adferrebant, non adducebant.* They brought them, not led them, not led them by the hand, but brought them in their armes, Thus they brought them.

3. And after the same manner Christ received, and embraced them. [*Hee tooke them in his armes.*] *καταλαβωνας*, (saith our Evangelist) *ulnis amplexus*: even as mothers doe their children. All evidencing and clearing the condition of the persons that were brought. They were *Children, Babes, Infants*.

III. And to whom did they bring them? *Vnto him, unto Christ*. Thus others before had brought diverse aged persons unto him, who had received benefit by him. And thereupon these tender mothers they doe as much for their children; [*they bring them to Christ.*]

3. To whom they were brought.

IV. And to what end did they bring them. [*That hee might touch them* (saith our Evangelist:) *that he might put his hands upon them and pray*, (saith St. Matthew:) that is, that by laying his hands upon them hee might *blesse them*. Such *benedictions* Parents were anciently wont to seek for their children, and children for themselves. Thus did *Jacob* and *Esau*, each seek a blessing at the hands of their father *Isack*. And thus did *Joseph* seek a blessing for his two sons *Ephraim* and *Manasses*; bringing them to his father *Jacob*, that he might lay his hands upon them, and blesse them; i.e. pray for them, and in the name of God pronounce a blessing upon them. Such a blessing (it seemeth) the people of God were frequently wont to seek for their children at the hands of those whom they apprehended to be indued with propheticall and extraordinarie spirits. And thus these mothers, looking upon Christ as a *Prophet*, a *great Prophet*, the *great Prophet*, they bring their Infants unto him, that they might receive a benediction from him.

4 To what end.

Math. 19. 13.

Gen. 27.

Gen. 28.

The Doctrine and practice of Pædobaptisme

The words being thus briefly opened, we may take up a double observation from them.

1. That Infants are subjects capable of benefit by Christ.
2. That it is the best office that Parents can performe unto their Children, to bring them unto Christ. Breifly of each.

Obfer. 1.
Infants ca-
pable of be-
nefit by
Christ.

Infants are subjects capable of benefit by Christ: So much certainly these devout persons who here brought these children to him apprehended and believed. Wherefore else should they have brought them, had they not apprehended them to have been subjects capable of benefit by him. And surely such they are; capable, and that not onely of temporall, but of spirituall benefit: viz. of Remission of sinnes, of Regeneration, Justification, Sanctification, Glorification.

Object.
Infants doe
not actually
believe.

But how can this be (saith the Anabaptist) seeing that Infants doe not *actually* believe? They cannot lay hold upon Christ by *faith*; how then shall they receive any benefit by him?

Answ.
Christ can
touch them,
though not
touched by
them.

To this I answer; *Though they cannot lay hold upon Christ, yet Christ can lay hold upon them.* Though they cannot *touch* him, yet hee can *touch* them. And this is sufficient. Marke the Text: [*They brought children unto Christ that hee should touch them.*] Not that they should touch him, but that hee should touch them. Christ can, and often doth touch them by a *vertuall contract*, communicating spirituall benedictions and blessings unto them, who are not able to *touch* him, I meane actually to beleive on him. This is the case of *Infants*; they are not sensible of the need they have of Christ, neither can they seek a blessing for themselves, they cannot by an actuall
faith

faith lay hold upon him: yet is this no impediment unto them. For all this, Christ may, and often doth communicate himselfe unto them; apprehending them, though not apprehended by them. In adults, in persons come to yeares of discretion, and to the use of reason, both these meet together, even a mutuall apprehension, the one resulting from the other. Believers they apprehend Christ, and they are apprehended of Christ. This is that which Paul desireth for himselfe, Phil. 3. *I follow after* (saith he) *if I may apprehend that for which I am also apprehended of Jesus Christ.* Paul was apprehended of Christ; viz. by his free grace accepting of him; and his desire is, that he might more and more apprehend Gods love and favour in Christ, viz. by faith and experience. Thus doe Christians when they are come to yeares of discretion, apprehend Christ; then they touch him, as that Woman in the Gospell did, who came and touched the hemme of his Garment, drawing vertue from him by her faith. Thus indeed Infants cannot apprehend him; they cannot touch him. In the meane time it is enough that they are apprehended of Christ, touched by him. So were these Infants here in the Text. *[They brought Children unto Christ that he should touch them.]*

Phil. 3. 12.

Mat. 9.

Appli. Stand not then to reason with flesh and blood about the manner of Christs coming, and communicating himselfe, and his grace unto Infants. This doth the Anabaptist; and because sense and reason cannot resolve his doubt, viz. How Baptisme should be made effectuell unto Infants, seeing they doe not actually believe; therefore he will not be-

Applica.
Stand not to reason with flesh & blood about this mystery.

Iohn 20.

lieve that it can bee any wayes beneficiall to them, what is this but to take up *Thomas* his Resolution: *Unlesse I shall see the print of the nayles, and put my fingers into them, &c. I will not believe.* These Women (or who ever they were that brought these Children unto Christ) they were of another minde. They knew not which way vertue should go out from *Iesus Christ* unto their *Infants*; yet they bring them, render them unto him, only desiring that hee would touch them, which if hee would vouchsafe to doe, they doubt not but their *Infants* should bee the better for it. Surely what ever *flesh and blood, carnall sense and reason* (which are no competent judges in divine and spirituall mysteries) may suggest. The Sacrament of Baptisme is not un-usefull, nor alwayes ineffectuall unto *Infants*. God can, and (no question) often doth concur with his *Ordinance*, communicating the *inward grace* with the *outward signe*, working that *grace of Regeneration* in *Infants*, whereof Baptisme is a *Signe and Seale*. If for our parts wee cannot conceive how, or after what manner God should worke this worke in them, let not that stagger our beliefe. Considering that there are many other things which are above our *sense and reason*, yet not above our *faith*. Wee believe that they are, though we know not in what way they are effected. Who is there that knoweth the way of his own *naturall birth*? how the body is framed and fashioned in the wombe? how, and when the soule commeth to be infused into it? Even such is the way of God in many of his works. So saith the *Preacher, Eccles. 11.*

[As

[As thou knowest not what is the way of the Spirit, nor how the bones do grow in the wombe of her that is with childe, so thou knowest not the works of God.] Such are many of his works, many of his wayes, *ἀνεξιχνίασι ὁδοί*, untraceable

Eccles. 11. 5.

Rom. 11. 33.

wayes, wayes past finding out. And such in particular is the way of God in the worke of Regeneration; a mysterious way, the manner of it being above sense and reasons comprehension. So much our Saviour tells Nicodemus, Ioh. 3. [The winde bloweth where it listeth, &c. So is every one that is borne of the Spirit.] The winde bloweth variously, sometimes in this quarter, sometimes in that, and who can give a reason of it. Such is the worke of the Spirit. A mysterious worke. If we cannot give a reason of it, and set forth the manner of its working, let not this our ignorance prejudice our faith. What wee cannot comprehend, yet let us apprehend. What we cannot see, yet believe. So did these devout persons here in the Text. Having seene the power of Christ exercised upon others, they doubt not but their children also were capable of benefit by him; so as if he would but touch them, they should fare the better for it, and thereupon they bring them unto him.

I have done with the former observation. As briefly of the latter.

It is the best office that Parents can performe unto their children, to bring them unto Christ. So these mothers here thought of it. They knew not how to performe a better office unto these their Infants, then to present them unto Christ. And therein they were not deceived.

Obser.

The best office Parents can doe for their Children, to bring them to Christ.

In as much as (Christ,) Iesus Christ is the storehouse and

Reason 1.

Christ a
storehouse of
blessings.
1 Ephes. 3.

and Treasury of all blessings. Blessed be God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (saith the Apostle) who hath blessed us with all spirituall blessings in heavenly things in Christ.] Spirituall blessings (which are the best blessings) they are layd up in Christ, to be dispenced by him. God his Father hath made him (as I may say) his high-Almoner to distribute his bounty to the sons of men. Whether then can poore necessitous creatures repaire better than unto Christ? And such are Infants naturally.

Reason 2.
Infants ne-
cessitous
creatures.

2. Let that be a second Reason; viz the great necessity that Infants have of Iesus Christ. Without him they are lost creatures, for ever lost. Such they come in to the world, in a lost condition; being all sinners by nature. Sinners by Imputation, having the sinne of their first Parents charged upon them: Sinners by reall communication, being heires of their forefathers corruption. Now this being their condition, they stand in need of a Saviour, a susceptor, one that may undertake for them, and stand betwixt the wrath of God and them. And who can do this but the Saviour of the world, the Lord Christ? Now put these together, Christs Al-sufficiencie, and their necessitie; wee shall see ground and reason enough for this Assertion, that it is the best office that Parents can doe to their Children, to bring them unto Christ.

Applica

Let it be applied briefly by way of Conviction, Instruction.

Use 1.

The prepos-
terous care
of carnall
Parents.

By way of Conviction. Let carnall Parents here take notice of the preposterousnesse of their care and solicitude for their children in seeking all other things for

for them, in the meane time neglecting this. Other things they will lay out, and lay up for them, necessities and conveniencies for the outward man. They shall not want either food or rayment, It may be they will give them civill nurture and education, bringing them up in some honest trade or occupation, where by they may live like men in the world: And they will doe what they can to gather a portion for them, to leave them an Inheritance. But in the mean time, as for bringing them to Christ, and interesting them in him, this they never thinke of. And what is this but with *Martha* to bee solicitous about many things, but whereas there is but one thing necessary, to over-look that. Surely such is the interesting of children in *Iesus Christ*. Other things may bee for conveniency, this for necessity.

Luke 10. 41.

Be convinced then of your folly herein, you who are so indulgent towards, and provident for your children, that you thinke all the care you can take for them for their temporall welfare, to bee little enough, but in the meane time take no thought to bring them unto Christ, to have union and communion with him. Hereby you may expresse a naturall, but no Christian affection; that is true Christian affection, which putteth forth it selfe in bringing others unto Christ.

But what shall we then thinke (in the second place) of those who are so farre from bringing their children unto Christ, that they rather keep them off from him: Prejudicing them against the wayes of Christ, by their owne scandalous examples. Cruell, un-naturall Parents! Since account them, who

The worst office to keep children from Christ.

The Doctrine and Practice of Redemptive Baptisme

Levit. 10. 1.

Vse 2.
Instruction.
To excite
Parents to
this duty.

Matt. 9. 2.

Luke 10. 1.

2 Sam. 19.

37.

The worst
officers keep
children
from Christ

offered up their children into *Molech*. What are they who (as much as in them lyeth) offer them up unto *Satan*? By way of *Instruction*. Let *Parents* here take notice of their duty, and be excited to discharge it: endeavouring (what in them lyeth) to bring their children unto *Christ*. The best office, the truest act of charity you can performe to them. So we look upon that act of those who brought that poore *Paralytike*, the man sicke of the Palsie unto *Christ*. Hee could not come himselfe, they bring him. The greatest piece of charity they could possibly have shewed him. Suppose it, that they had otherwise contributed largely and liberally to his necessities, giving him meat and drinke, and apparell, and money; all this had beene nothing in comparison of what they now did for him. What ever copies, what ever natural affection the most tender hearted Parents in the world can shew to their children, should they provide never so well for them in all other respects, yet this is more than all, to bring them to *Christ*. The truest and highest preferment that a Parent can preferre his childe unto, to preferre him unto *Christ*. Old *Bazillai* could not doe more for his sonne *Ghinai* than to preferre him unto *David*, to be his follower, his attendant. Hee well knew that *David* could do more for him than himselfe could. Upon the same ground preferre we our children unto *Christ*. They cannot fynde a better Master, none so able to doe for them as hee. Little it is that wee ourselves can doe for them. Much we have done & doe yet, in communicating and transmitting our

corrupted nature to them, thereby laying them under guilt, and making them children of wrath. This have we done against them to make them miserable. Now all that we can doe for them, cannot free them from that condition. O labour to bring and present them unto him that can, even unto Iesus Christ.

But which way shall this be done? How shall Parents bring their children unto Christ? or what shall they doe to this end?

Take some directions briefly. I shall reduce them to three heads. Something is to be done for them before they are borne. Something when they are borne, in their Infancy. Something when they come to yeares of understanding.

1. Before they are born, whilst they are yet in the wombe. Parents should have a care to sanctifie their children. Sanctifie them? How? Why (as all other things are to be sanctified) by prayer, and thanksgiving. Children are an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the wombe is his reward (saith the Psalmist.) Being so, they should be blessed in the wombe. First, by blessing God for them, for the hopes of them. Secondly, by commending them unto his blessing. This doing

Then (in the second place) let Parents make sure (as much as in them lieth) that they may bee borne under the promise, under the Covenant. As for the Planet it matters not: if they be but borne under the Promise, wee may looke upon them as a hopefull seed.

2. But what shall or what can the Parent doe to bring the Child under the Promise?

Quest.

How shall Parents bring their children to Christ, and what they are to doe to that end.

Ans.

A threefold direction.

1.

Before they are borne.

1.

Sanctifie them in the wombe by prayer.

Psal. 127. 3.

2.

Make sure they may bee borne under the Covenant.

The Doctrine and practice of Paedobaptisme

1. Make sure he be under it himself; make sure his owne interest in the Covenant, that God is his God in Christ. Being so, then may hee have a comfortable hope that God will bee the God of his seed also. So runs the Covenant. [*I will bee thy God, and the God of thy seed.*] This are Parents to doe for their children whilst they are yet in the wombe before they are borne.

2. Secondly, when they are borne, then first give them *up unto God*. Even as these mothers here in the Text, they bring their children unto Christ, putting them into his Hands, his Armes. Thus should Parents deal with their children, having received them from God, they should give them unto God againe, putting them into his hands, casting them upon his arms, putting them into the hands of his Fatherly providence, to be ordered and disposed of by him, according to his good pleasure. Casting them upon the Armes of his everlasting mercie in Iesus Christ, begging for them a gracious acceptance. For the assurance whereof,

3. Bring them to Baptisme. Secondly, their next care must bee to tender them to the Ordinance, the Sacrament of Baptisme, to get the Seal of the Covenant set upon them; to get them marked out for salvation; a care which lyeth most properly upon the Parents. Not that they are absolutely bound to present them with their owne hands. True it is, these mothers here they bring their children unto Christ in their owne Armes (as is most probable,) and so Christ taketh them into his. But as for the latter of these, I know you will readily yeeld it, that it is not binding, that because Christ

Whether mothers are bound to present their children with their owne hands.

tooke

took these children into his Armes to *blesse* them; therefore *Ministers* should necessarily take children into their Armes to Baptize them. No more doe I conceive, the former to bee, that because these Mothers brought their owne children unto Christ, therefore all *Mothers* ought to bring their children to the Sacrament of Baptisme, and there present them to the Ordinance in their owne Armes. Sure I am, in Circumcision it was otherwise. But herein, if any seeme to bee contentious, I will not contest with them; onely I will say with the Apostle in another case; *we have no such custome,* nor (for ought I know) *the Churches of God.*

1 Cor. II.
16.

But in the meane time, the chiefe care lyeth upon the *Parents*; and that specially and chiefly upon the *Father*. So did the care of Circumcision. Thence was it, that God was ready to slay *Moses* for neglecting of it; suffering his sonne to bee uncircumcised.

The chiefe care lyeth upon the *Parents*, specially upon the father.
Exod. 4. 24.

2. But what if the other Parent, the *Mother* be unwilling withall, not willing the childe should bee Baptized? It is a case which possibly may fall out in these dividing times. Now in this case what should the husband doe? Should he please his wife, and neglect this Ordinance?

Quest.
What if the mother bee unwilling?

A. It was the very case (as *Junius*, and divers other good Expositors conceive) betwixt *Moses* and *Zipporah*. *Zipporah* not being as yet fully instructed in the Religion of God, nor fully brought off to it, and withall an indulgent mother, was unwilling that her childe should be Circumcised. Hereupon *Moses* per husband *in gratiam uxoris*, to please

Ans.
The case of *Moses* and *Zipporah*.

Let not Parents deferre this Ordinance upon carnall reasonings.

and content his wife, deferre the Circumcising of him. But what the issue was the story tells you, and yourselves may easily make the application.

Let not Parents then either neglect, or deferre this Ordinance beyond what is meet, where it may be had, according to Christs Institution. Herein let them not stand to reason with flesh and blood about it (as the Anabaptists doe), what good, what benefit a poore Infant shall receive from, or by this Sacrament, seeing it apprehends nothing, understandeth not what is done to it. No more did the Circumcised Infant, it only felt the smart of Circumcision, (as Infants now doe the coldnesse of the water) but the mystery and meaning it apprehended not, yet was not Circumcision thereupon to be deferred, till it came to years of understanding. No more ought this Sacrament, which cometh in the roome of Circumcision. What though *sense* and *reason* cannot tell us how this ordinance should be beneficiall, yet submit to it, resting upon God in the use of it. Knowing and remembering that in *sacred actions*, of this nature, we are to *capivate our owne understandings*, bringing them into obedience unto Christ, dealing with him not by reason, but by faith. So much our Saviour intimates unto us in the 15. of this Chapter, where he tels us, that *whosoever shall not receive the Kingdome of God as a little childe, hee shall not enter therein.* Children, we see how they yeeld up themselves unto their Parents pleasures, believing, submitting, and obeying, without disputing and reasoning. Thus should Christians yeeld up themselves to the pleasure of their Lord and Master Christ, believing his words,

submit-

emilings asserted and vindicated.

dy

submitting to his commandments, though to reason never so unreasonable. Thus did Abraham when he was 99. yeares old submit to Circumcision, though to reason, a ridiculous uncomely ceremonie. What ever reason dictates, yet neglect not this ordinance of God, the bringing of our children, and consecrating them unto God by the Sacrament of Baptisme: which if it should not be for the present beneficiall unto the childe, yet to the Parents it may be, being to them a signe and seale for the confirmation of their faith in believing the promise made to them, and to their seed.

Gen. 17. 24.

But what needeth this? Is not the promise it selfe sufficient? And cannot God as well make it good unto our children without this Sacrament? So Chemnitius brings in some reasoning against this act of these women in the Text, as if it favoured more of superstition, then of devotion, viz. that they could not be contented with Christs praying for their children, but they would needs have him to touch them. The Centurion (say they) was of another minde. He doth not bring his servants unto Christ, or desire Christ to goe unto him. Only speak the word (saith hee) and my servant shall be whole. And this act of his (say they) it was farre more commendable then this of the women here, who brought their children unto Christ, that hee should touch them. From whence they argue, that Parents having the word, the word of promise, they shall not need this Sacrament for their children.

Object.

The Promise is sufficient, though unsealed. Chemnit. Har. ad loc.

When children are brought unto Christ, they are sealed.

Matth. 8. 8.

Ephe. 6. 4.

Ans. Meanes afforded for the helpe of

To this we reply, it is true, God can make good the promise unto them, saving them without this

[The word]

our infirmity
and strength-
ning our faith
are not to be
neglected,

Isaiah. 7. 12.

3. When chil-
dren come to
yeares of dis-
cretion,

1. Instruct
them in the
knowledge
of Christ.

2 Tim. 3. 15.

Ephes. 6. 4.

Gen. 18. 19.

Sacrament, as our Saviour could and sometimes did
heale those which were diseased without touching
of them, or coming neere to them. But seeing God
is pleased so farre to condescend unto our weaknesse, as
to give us a *signe* for the confirmation of our faith,
in this case to sleight it, to neglect it, to refuse it,
what is it but to tempt God? It was *Ahaz* his case yee
know. The Lord bid him aske a *signe* for the con-
firmation of his faith in the promise. He refuseth
it as a thing needlesse. [*I will not aske a signe, neither
will I tempt the Lord.*] Nay *Ahaz*, in not asking it
at Gods command, therein thou didst tempt the
Lord, not to believe Gods word without his *seale*;
not to believe the *promise* without a *signe*; this is in-
deed to tempt God. But where God affordeth a *signe*
for the help of our *infirmities*, there to refuse it, to ne-
glect it, is both *presumption* and *rebellion*.

The 3. head is yet behinde, what parents are to
doe for their children when they come to yeares of
understanding, in way of bringing them to Christ.
Here again two things.

1. *Instruct them in the knowledge of Christ.* In fill-
ling into them, so soone as they are capable of them,
the *principles* of Christian Religion. Thus was *Timothie*
brought up; *From a childe hee knew the holy scrip-
tures, &c.* And thus should Christian parents bring
up their children; bring them up in the *nurture and ad-
monition of the Lord*, (as *Paul* exhorts his *Ephesians*;) *teaching them to know God and Iesus Christ; com-
manding them to walke in the wayes of God.* This
will *Abraham* doe: [*I know* (saith the Lord) *that he
will command his children, &c. and they shall keep the
way of the Lord.*] In

In the second place, goe with them, goe before them, leading them unto Christ by their own examples. It is that which taketh place with children more then all precepts and instructions whatsoever: And without this the other will doe little good. Would we then have our children brought home unto Christ, be we our selves followers of him. Not dealing by our children as old Barzillai did by his son Chimham, whom he leaves to follow David, when himselfe departed from him. Even thus doe some parents. They could be content their children should follow Christ, and be religious, whilst in the meane time themselves turne their backs upon him, and his Religion, walking loosely, making no conscience either of sins, or duties. Now what is this but to prejudice their children against that way, wherein they would have them to walke? Would we have our children come unto Christ, goe with them, as these mothers here did, leade them, and shew them the way by our own example. And thus I have done with the first branch of the text; the first act; viz. of these mothers, or who ever they were that brought these children unto Christ.

1. Leading them to Christ by example.

2 Sam. 19. 39.

And his disciples rebuked those that brought them:] Come we now to the second act in this Historie, viz. the act of the Disciples, prohibiting these Infants, not without a check a rebuke to those that came, and tended them. So all the three Evangelists have it. *Ἐπιτιμασαν δὲ αὐτοὺς, increpabant eos*, saith Matthew and Luke, [they rebuked them.] Not the Infants themselves, but the bringers of them. So our Evangelist explaines it *Ἐπετίμασαν τοὺς προσφέροντας*; They rebuked those which brought them.] Thus these Infants were repulsed, and these

Act. 2. The act of the disciples double;

1. Repelling the Infants

those devout persons rebuked. Each will yeeld us something worth the observation.

Obfer.

Satans peculiar-ill will to children.

How Satan hinders children from coming to Christ.

2 King 13.

1. In the former take we notice of a peculiar ill-will Satan beareth to children; he hath an evill eye upon them, endeavouring by all meanes to keep them from coming to Christ, and so to hinder their salvation. This Satan doth many wayes. 1. Through the *indulgence of Parents* suffering them to have their owne wills. 2. Through *evill education*, poisoning their tender yeares, giving them such a tang then, as they shall retaine all their life after. 3. Sometimes under a *pretext of Religion*. Thus of old he instigated not only the *heathen*, but even Gods owne people to offer up their children in sacrifice to *Molock*, unto devils. And even thus doth he instigate those of the Church of *Rome* at this day, to sacrifice their children, to put them into *monasteries* before they know what they doe, which is little lesse than to offer them up unto Satan. 4. By *keeping them from the ordinations*. Thus he instigated the *disciples* here to repell these *Infants* from coming neere to Christ. And he it is that hath of late times instigated the *Anabaptists* to take up this quarrell, to prohibite the Baptisme of *Infants*, which is as much as in them lyeth to keep them from coming unto Christ.

Reason 1.

And wherefore should Satan have such an evill eye at them? Why he looketh upon them as the *seminarie*, the *nurserie* of the Church, out of which God taketh those *plants* wherewith he plants his *ord*, and therefore Satan hath an ill-will to them, that so he might hinder the encrease of the Church. Let *Parents* take notice of it, and be so much the more

more carefull and vigilant in *watching over their children*, not neglecting any meanes for their spirituall good; which if they shall doe, what doe they but leave them as a prey unto Satan, who will be ready enough to prey upon them.

Parents should be the more vigilant.

My purpose is onely to touch things as I goe. These Infants are *repelled*, and those which brought them are *checked, rebuked*.

2.

Rebuking those which brought them.

Thus *good intentions and pious undertakings* sometimes, oftentimes meet with impediments and discouragements; which sometimes God casts in the way of his people, sometimes Satan.

Obfer. 2.

Good undertakings subject to discouragements, cast in sometimes

1. God, for their *probation* and tryall, the tryall of their faith; as also for the *exercise* of that and other graces in them, which by the exercise of them come to be strengthened and increased. To this end it was that our blessed Saviour gave such harsh intertainment to that poore *Cananitish* woman that came to him in the behalfe of her daughter; First, bidding his disciples dismiss her, [*send her away*.] Then himselfe shaking her off, telling her hee had nothing to doe with her, or for her. [*I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*.] Then giving her tart, and course language, calling her a dog. [*It is not meete to take the childrens bread, and cast it unto dogs*.] All this he did for her probation and tryall, to try and exercise her faith. These ends God hath in it.

Reason. 1.

By God for the tryall of his people, & exercise of their graces.

Math. 15.

v. 23.

v. 24.

v. 26.

2. Satan hath other ends, *viz.* to discourage, dishearten the people of God, to beate them off, and make them desist, and leave off their undertakings, and therefore he endeavourth to crush them in the

Reason 2.

By Satan to dishearten them.

Numb. 31.

Applica.
Fore-armed
against dis-
courage-
ments.

shell, and nip them in the blid. *Take we notice of it, and make use of it, that being fore-warned, we may also be fore-armed, against what ever discouragements wee shall meet with. Not disheartned by them. Alas, these are no new or wonted things, but such as Gods people have frequent experience of. Let them not dull or rebate the edge of our endeavours, but rather whet, and set them. Sowre sauces in the beginning of a meale, they whet the appetite. Even such use make wee of what ever impediments and discouragements shall encounter us in the entrance upon any pious, religious undertaking. Let them be rather as whets, to sett an edge upon our resolutions.*

Let not new
commers to
Christ bee
discouraged.

And in particular, let it be usefull to *new beginners, new commers to Christ, young Christians.* At first conversion, when they doe but begin to looke towards God and Christ, they oftentimes meet with such entertainment, as these *Infants* here did. They finde *course usage* from the world; *Course language* (it may bee,) or an overly carriage from friends and acquaintance, mocks and checks from others: And happily God himselfe (or Satan by his permission) may strow some *Marices*, some *Caltraps*, some crosses in their way. But let not all discourage, still hold on. In the end, what ever the world doth, bee you assured, *Christ* will smile upon you, and embrace you, as here he doth these *Infants*. To passe on,

These *Infants* were *repulsed*, and those which brought them *checked*. But by whom? By the *Disciples of Christ*. [*His Disciples rebuked those which brought them.*] What see we here?

Even

Even good men, holy and gracious men, may sometimes *Observ.*
 be impediments to pious and Religious undertakings.] It *Holy men*
 was Peter that assayed to perswade his Master not to *may stand in*
 goe up to *Ferusalem.* [*Master favour thy selfe.*] Here *the way of*
 was an assay to hinder the best worke that ever was *religious un-*
 done, (the worke of our *Redemption,*) and that by *dertakings.*
 an *eminent Saint,* an *eminent Apostle.* Here in the Text *Matt. 16. 22.*
 the *Apostles,* whose office it was to *winne and bring all*
 sorts of persons unto Christ, yet they *prohibite these*
 children, and *rebuke those which brought them.* Thus
good men sometimes may bee back-friends to good causes.
 This God permits; this Satan incites to; this holy men
 yeeld to. See a Reason for each.

First, God permits it to the end that our faith (as the *Reason 1.*
 Apostle speaketh) should not stand in the wisdom of men, *God permits*
 nor yet in the holines of men. That we may learn not *it.*
 to make either the *Iudgement,* or *Practise* of man our
 Rule; our Rule to believe by; our Rule to walke by.

Secondly, Satan incites to it, the rather making use *2.*
 of these *Instruments,* because *least suspected,* and con- *Satan incites*
 sequently most *prevalent.* Thus at the first he made *to it; making*
 use of the *Woman* in tempting the *Man.* Adam could *use of such*
 not naturally suspect his *owne flesh;* hee could not *instruments,*
 suspect that poyson should bee reached forth to him *because least*
 by such a hand. None so likely to perswade with *suspected.*
 him, as his wife was. Vpon a like ground it is, that
 Satan maketh use of pious and godly persons, in crof-
 sing and hindering some pious undertakings. Thus
 hee made use of Peter, to take off his Master. So
 much our Saviour there expresseth, [*Get thee behind* *Matt. 16. 23.*
me Satan.] It was *Satan* that spoke in, and by Peter; Y
 making use of him as his *Instrument* in suggesting

The Doctrine and practice of Pædobaptisme

and conveying that temptation. And wherfore of him? Why, he thought if any could prevaile with Christ, Peter might as soone, or sooner than any.

³⁴ Holy men yeeld to it, because they know but in part.

¹ Cor. 13. 9. *in part.* As God permits, and Satan incites, so, *holy men sometimes yeeld*, and become instruments to God, and Satan in these services (or rather dis-services) in hindering of good: and that because they *know but in part.* It was so with the Disciples here. In prohibiting these children, they act according to their knowledge. They did not know their Masters mind concerning them; and thereupon they did what they did. Thus is it with good and holy men, they are sometimes Remoraes, *back-stayes* to a worke, that tends to the glory of Christ, and good of his Church. Whence is it? not from any ill-will they beare to either; but because they are not fully informed touching the minde of Christ: they are not perfectly instructed in the way of the Lord; wherein they walke according to their light.

Applica. Make use of it briefly, even that which I have already given you a hint of. Learn we hence, not to pin our faith or obedience upon other mens sleeves, nor to make the Judgement or practise of others (whatever they be) a Rule, a Standard for us to believe, or walke by.

A very common errour in these un-settled times. How many well-meaning soules are there every where, that bottom their faith upon the *miserable* corruption upon the *pitty* and holinesse of men? Take wee heed of it, Knowing that if we shall sayle by this *Compass*, we may be on ground before we are aware. You know who spake it. *Let God bee true, and every man a liar.* God only is infallible, and his Word is infallible.

infallible Rule. As for men, the wisest, the learnedest, the holiest, they are all *liars*, and that both *actively*, and *passively*, subject to deceive, and bee deceived. Take wee heed therefore of trying truth by this touchstone, of weighing truth in this ballance, by these weights; To the Word, to the Word. That will not, that cannot deceive. Humane judgement, humane *practise* may, though in persons never so eminent,

Take heed then how wee bee prejudiced against truth, because such or such assent not to it. Take heed how we let in *error*, because such or such embrace, and entertaine it. Surely, it is one of the prevailing Arguments of the times, that hath misled and seduced many, to the receiving and embracing of divers dangerous errors, even the good opinion and high esteeme which they have had of some who have gone in those wayes.

I will instance but in one, that which the Text leadeth me to, *viz.* The error of the *Anabaptists* in denying Baptisme unto children. An error which spreadeth farre and nigh in the Kingdome, to the present *disquietment*, to the future *danger* of the Church. Many in all places carried away with it. And what is it that so prevails with them for the sticking in of this error? why, Surely nothing more than the high opinion which they have of those who stand up in this cause; an opinion of their singular *piety*, *zeale*, *knowledge*. They are *knowing* Christians, *forward* and *zealous* Christians, *wise* Christians, such as desire to come to the *full*, and to follow Christ close. Such they apprehend them to bee? And I will

Anabaptists misled with an opinion of the piety of their leaders,

The Doctrine and practice of Pædobaptisme

will not deny, but some such may be found amongst them.) And hereupon they make their *judgements*, and *practise* a *standard*, a *patterne* to themselves. Surely (say they) it cannot bee but that they should bee in the right; A *knowing* people, a *praying* people, &c.

Ans. To meet with this *Error*, doe but looke upon this instance in the Text, and see who they were that *prohibited these children* from comming unto Christ, and *rebuked those which brought them*. They were not *Scribes* and *Pharisees*. They were not superstitious, or blinde, ignorant, or yet wicked and prophane persons. No, they were *Disciples*, followers of Christ, those who by reason of their constant attendance upon Christ, and familiar acquaintance with him, one would have thought should have understood his minde sooner than any, yet they fall into this very error; they would not have *children brought unto Christ*, for which they are reprov'd of their *Lord and Master*.

I doubt not, but even amongst that *Sect* which I am now speaking against, there may be some *pious*, *devout*, *humble* Christians, (though I feare not many, for in most of them you shall see a spirit of *pride* and *disdain*, and *bitternesse* against all that doe not walke by their light, but some such I hope there are) some *Disciples* of Christ, who do follow Christ according to their *light*, in the simplicity and uprightnesse of their hearts. Now what though they *debarre children from comming unto Christ*, and *rebuke those which bring them*, finding fault with the received practise of all the Churches in Baptizing of Infants: What then?

then? Shall we presently hearken unto them? Nay rather hearken unto Christ; so doe these women here in the text. The disciples prohibite, rebuke them, bid them be gone with their children. But Christ hee *incourageth* them, hee *invites* them. And to him they hearken not to his disciples. Suppose the adversaries to *childrens Baptisme* be some of them disciples of Christ, never so pious, never so zealous, never so eminent for grace, for holinesse, yet hearken we rather to their master, then to them; to him *inviting*, rather then to them *prohibiting*. [The disciples rebuked those which brought them.]

But upon what ground did the disciples this. What did they it out of malice? Out of envie? Were they unwilling that these *Infants* should receive any benefit from Christ? Surely not so. *Charitie envies not*: Grace is communicative, willing and desirous that others should have a share in the same Christ, and in the same benefits by Christ, whence was it then?

Surely out of Ignorance, & out of blind-zeale. Out of ignorance, ignorance of these two things.

1. They did not apprehend what need these Infants had of Christ. Not being troubled (as is most probably) with any *bodily infirmitie*, they did not see what should occasion this their address. [The whole need not the physician but the sicke.] Had they been sick and diseased, questionlesse the disciples would have admitted them as readily as they had done others; but being sound and *hale*, they put them back, as apprehending them to have no need of Christ.

2. As they apprehended that they had no need of Christ, so (probably) they did not conceive how

Did

they

Object.
The ground of this act of the disciples, not malice, or envie, but
1 Cor. 13. 4.

1.
Ignorance, of two things.
1. Of the need that these Infants had of Christ.
Matth. 9. 12.

2. How they
were capable
of receiving
benefit by
him.

they were capable of such benefit by him. Those which
came unto Christ, ordinarily they came for one of
these ends, to be benefited by him either in their bo-
dies, or in their soules. In their bodies by his miracles;
in their soules by his doctrine. Now as for the for-
mer of these, these Infants had no need of it; and
for the latter they were not capable of it, and con-
sequently the disciples could not see what they
should be the better for coming to Christ, and there-
upon repell them, keep them back.

Applica.

The Anabap-
tists grounds
in denying
Baptisme to
Infants, is
the same with
these of the
disciples.

1. Because In-
fants have no
need of it.

And are not these the very grounds, the chiefe
grounds that the Anabaptists goe upon at this day, in
debarring children from the Sacrament of Baptisme?

1. They have no need of Baptisme (say they.) And

2. They are not capable of benefit by it.

1. They have no need of Baptisme. How so? In as
much as they are free from original sinne, (that is the
doctrine of the compleat Anabaptist.) Infants (say
they) doe not stand charged with Adams sinne.

And as for any sinne of their owne, whether origi-
nall, or actual, they are not guilty of it. Original sin

*Discrepancy
in the
text*

*in the
text*

*in the
text*

*in the
text*

in Infants (saith one of their books) is but a Ro-
mish invention, brought in as a foot by those Antichristi-
an factors, that they might have an occasion to extoll,

and despise their queen of heaven, the virgin Mary, whom
alone amongst all the posterity of Adam, they exempt

from the common condition. Now being free from sin

(say they) from the guilt of sinne, and from the
stain of sinne, what need have they of this laver,

which is ordained for the washing away of sins?

[Christ is to be baptized, and wash away thy sinnes,] (saith
Matthew to Paul.) The people of Jerusalem that mira-
culous

Act 12. 16.

culous bath, it was proper for lepers, and cripples, and such other diseased bodies; as for others they received no benefit by it. And so is it with this spiritual, this heavenly bath, it is appointed for leprous, sin-sick-soules, not for Infants who are not troubled with any such maladies.

Againe secondly, as they have no need of Baptisme, so what benefit can they receive by it, or from it, being void, and destitute of understanding, of reason, and consequently of faith, upon which depends the efficacy of this, and all other the ordinances of God. This it is that qualifyeth a person for the Sacrament of Baptisme, his faith in Christ. *If thou believest, thou mayest* [saith Phillip to the Eunuch.] And this it is that draweth vertue, and benefit from the ordinance, which without this is rendred wholly ineffectually.

These are their reasonings, and are they not (for substance) the very same with the supposed reasonings of the disciples here in the text? They would not have the Infants brought unto Christ, Why? They had no need of him, being in perfect health, free from sicknesse, and they could receive no benefit by him, being void of understanding. Even thus saith the Anabaptist, what should children be brought to Baptisme? They have no need of it, being free from sinne, neither can they have any benefit by it, being voide of faith.

Now to both these we may say, as our blessed Saviour once did to the Sadducees in another case; when they represented to him their misapprehensions touching the Doctrine of the Resurrection. [They erre (saith he) not knowing the scriptures, nor the power

2. They are not capable of benefit by Baptisme.

Heb. 4. 2.

Act. 8. 37.

Both erre, not knowing the scriptures,

Matth. 22. 29.

Matth. 22. 29
So did the
disciples.

Psal. 8. 2.

Psal. 22. 9.

Matth. 18. 2.

Ioh. 6. 7.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

Matth. 18. 2.

of God. I Surely so did the disciples here in repulsing these Infants, they erred not knowing the scriptures. The scriptures would have told them, that out of the mouths of babes and sucklings God hath ordained himselfe praises, Psal. 8. The scripture would have told them, that God maketh Infants to hope whilst they hang upon their mothers breasts, and that hee is their God from their mothers belly, Psal. 22. The scripture could have told them what their Lord and master had said, All that the Father giveth me, shall come unto me, and him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out, Joh. 6. As also what he had done, and that but a little before this act of theirs. Now he had expressed his affection to Infants, by taking one, and setting it in the midst amongst them, propounding him as a patterne for their imitation. This they either knew not, or remembered not, or considered not. Thus they erred not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of Jesus Christ, how he was able to communicate his vertue to Infants, as well as any others.

So doe the
Anabaptists
Psal. 51.
Ephes. 2.

Even to doe the Anabaptists at this day. They erre, not knowing the scriptures, which will informe them, that children are conceived in sinne, and brought forth in iniquity; and are by nature children of wrath, and consequently, have need of Christ, and of this ordinance of Christ. Nor yet knowing the power of God, how he is able to make this ordinance effectually unto them, though for the present destitute of actual faith. Here is the first ground of this error in the disciples; ignorance, misapprehension.

Blind zeale
for their ma-
sters

The second is not much unlike, viz. their blinde-
zeale; zeale for their master; 1. For his honour; 2.

For

For his *ease*, both which probably they had an eye at.

First, his *Honour*. They thought it dishonourable to their Lord and Master, that he should be troubled with such *Clients*. *Non vacat exiguis*. — Had they beene *Kings* and *Princes*, or persons of quality, such as those three *Wise men of the East* were, that brought Presents to him in his Cradle. Had they beene persons that came to doe him homage, to put any temporall honour upon him; had they brought a *Crown* to put upon his head, to make him a *King*. Now (saith *Calvin*) in all likely-hood they should have beene welcome, none more. For, his it was that had dazeled the Disciples eyes, even a mis apprehension of a *temporall kingdome*, which they expected, and hoped their Master would take upon him. Whereupon, what ever made and tended that way, they were ready to embrace it. In the meane time, not understanding that the Kingdome of Christ was *not of this world*; which if they had, in likely-hood they would not have repulsed these *Infants* as they did, as if it would have beene a disparagement to their Lord and Master, to have any thing to doe with them.

2. They had an eye herein to his *ease*; they saw that their master wanted no worke, no employment already, so many of all sorts flocking unto him, as that he had scarce leisure to take his repast for them. Now if *Infants* also should be admitted, they feared he would be over-charged, over-burdened.

These were their thoughts (as *Expositors* most rationally, and probably conjecture.) Certainly how-

Observ.

Two dangerous counsellours and guides.

1.

Carnall reason.

ever, some carnall reasoning it was, seconded with a blind-Zeale, that made them do what they did. [Two dangerous things to consult with, and to bee led by in the matters of Christ.]

A dangerous thing to consult with carnall reason; To make sense and reason sit as Judges upon Christ, and upon the mysteries of the Kingdome of God. Surely, this it is that hath brought a world of errors into the world. Men will not submit to the judgment of the Word, but they will call in carnall reason to advise with. Hence are most of the errors in the Church of Rome at this day. Their Bread-worship, wherein they thinke they doe a speciall honour unto Christ, in falling down before the consecrated Host, being Transubstantiated, turned into the Body of Christ (as they conceive.) Their Saint-worship, wherein againe they thinke they doe great honour unto Christ, in not coming unto him immediately, but making use of Court-favourites, Saints or Angels as their mediators to make their way, and present their Petitions for them. Thus doe they by this meanes fancie a new Christ unto themselves, taking from him that which properly belongeth to him, and attributing to him that which is heterogeneous, not agreeable, but dishonourable to his nature.

From the same fountain spring many of the errors of the times. Socinian and Arminian errors generally all of them. Anabaptisticall errors many of them. They judge of divine mysteries, decrees, ordinances, not by faith submitting to the Word, but by sense and reason. A dangerous Counsellor in these matters, not to be hearkned to without, much lesse against the Word.

2. And

And as reason is a dangerous Counsellour, so
blinde-zeale is a dangerous guide. This was that *Ignis-
 fatuus* that led *Pauls* Countrymen (the *Jewes*) wilde,
 that led them into those bogs and quick-sands of le-
 gal Ceremonies, and ran them on ground upon the main
 of their owne legall righteousnessse. They had a Zeale of
 God, (or for God) but not according to knowledge,] (as the *Rom, 10.20:*
 Apostle tells them.) And this it is that mis-leadeth
 many poore devout soules in the Church of Rome,
 (whose case is to be pittied,) putting them upon all
 their superstitious *will-worship*, wherein they take a
 great deale of paines to go to heaven, more than the
 most of us doe. They have a Zeale of God, of Christ,
 but not according to knowledge. And surely, this is the
grand-seducer amongst us at this day, that which mis-
 leadeth a multitude of well-meaning soules in this
 Kingdome, *Anabaptists, Antinomians, Seperatists*.
 They stand for Christ, whom they desire to have ex-
 alted, and (as they thinke) for the ordinances of Christ,
 which they desire to have set up with the greatest pu-
 ritie and simplicitie. And herein they shew themselves
 Zealous, *I, ὡς παρ' ὁρθῆς* (as Paul said of himselfe *Gal. 1. 14*
 before his conversion) more exceedingly Zealous, but
 alas, their zeale is not according to knowledge. Even
 as the *Disciples* here, they have a Zeale for their Ma-
 ster, as for his ease, so for his honour, and thereupon
 they keepe backe these Infants from comming to
 him. But it was not according to knowledge, a
blinde-zeale. By this meanes (contrary to their in-
 tentions) they came to dishonour him whom they in-
 tended to honour. For wherein lyeth the honour of a
 Prince more than in the multitude of Subjects? *Prov. 14.28.*
 multitude

The Doctrine and practice of Pædobaptisme

multitude of people, is the Kings honour.] No one thing more honourable unto Christ, than to have multitudes of all sorts of persons, both old and young, repaying and resorting to him, and receiving benefit by him. To keepe backe any of these from coming to him, is an act not more *injurious* to the persons so repulsed, than *dishonourable* unto him.

Like issues and fruits of *blinde-Zeale* are but too observable amongst some of the *Sectaries* of the times, who in pretending to *advance* and *exalt* Christ, doe in truth *debase* and *dishonour* him. In pretending to *set up* his *Ordinances*, they rather *pull them downe*, *destroying* what they pretend, and intend to *build*.

Of such dangerous consequence is it to bee led by such a *guide*. A fiery hot mettalled *horse* wanting his *eyes* is but dangerous to the *Rider*, specially if the *reynes* be cast upon his necke. And such is *blind-Zeale* to a *well-meaning*, but *ignorant* soule, being given way to, it will run a man upon precipices, and downfalls, which shall neither be *honourable* unto God, nor *safe* to himselfe.

All of us take heed of this Guide. Be *Zealous*, but let it be 1. in a *good matter*. And 2ly. in a *right manner*. To that end regulating our zeale by the *Word*. It is *Dauids* prayer, [*Lord order my steps in thy Word.*] And it was his *practise*, to make the *Word* a *light* unto his feet, and a *lanthorne* unto his pathes. Herein let him be our *patterne*; knowing that they are not *good intentions* that will beare out *unwarrantable practises*. The *Disciples* *intention* here (no question) it was *good*, but yet their *act* *reprovable*. They *rebuke* others, and *Christ rebuketh them*. So it followeth.

Psal. 119.
133.
vers. 105.

Verf.

Verf. 14.

But when Iesus saw it, he was displeased, and said unto them, suffer little children to come unto mee, &c.

Come we now to the third and last Act in this History. In the two former, we have the controversy betwixt the Disciples, and those which brought these Infants. In this, we have our Saviours arbitration, and decision of that controversy. Wherein we may take notice of three particulars; Our Saviours Affection, Speech, Act. What he thought of this act of his Disciples, what he said to it; what he did upon it. 1. His Affection. [He was displeased.] 2. His Speech to his Disciples; wherein we have a Charge, and a Reason for it. His Charge, [Suffer little children to come unto me, &c.] The Reason of that Charge, first propounded; [for of such is the Kingdome of God;] then confirmed and illustrated by an argument a majori, from the greater to the lesse; [Verily, I say unto you, whosoever doth not receive the Kingdome of God as a little childe, &c.] 3ly, His Act, which is three-fold, all towards these Infants. 1. His suscepcion, [he tooke them in his armes.] 2ly, His Imposition of hands, [he layd his hands upon them.] 3ly, His Benediction, [he blessed them.] Of these in their order. Begin with the first, wherein the History expresseth our Saviours affection, what he thought of this act of his Disciples. [when he saw it, he

Acts 3.
Our Saviours
Arbitration;
wherein 3.
particulars.

1.
His affection,
on, what hee
thought of
this act of his
Disciples.

The Doctrine and Practice of Pædobaptisme

was displeased; (*much displeased*) (saith our new Translation.) *Indignè tulit*, saith the vulgar, *he tooke it ill at their hands*. *Indignatus est* (saith Beza) *hee looked upon it with indignation*. What see we here?

Obfer.

Good intentions will not beare out unwarrantable actions.

2 Sam. 6. 6.
Mat. 16. 23.

Good intentions will not beare out unwarrantable actions.] *Uzzah* had no ill thought in putting his hand to the *Arke*, yet you know how it was taken. *Peter* had no evill meaning in advising his Master to *favour* himselfe, yet you know what a tart rebuke he received, [*Get thee behinde me Satan.*] The *Disciples* here, in keeping backe these *Infants*, they had an eye at their Masters both *ease*, and *honour*; yet they have no thanks for their labour. Their Master is so far from accepting of that their officious service, that he *distastes* it, he was *much displeased* with it.

Applica.

Let not Will-worship look for acceptance with God

Let Will-worship never looke for better acceptance at the hands of God. Voluntary services which men perform unto God without the rule, what ever the intentions of the performers may be; or what ever the wifedome or holinesse in the things themselves, God will never owne them, never accept them. I doubt not, but it was a devout and Religious intention that first hatched and bred most of that Will-worship, which is to be found in the Church of Rome at this day. Their Bread-worship, their Saint-worship, their Image-worship, they intended the honour of Christ in all. All their pompious and costly Ceremonies, they were introduced upon this ground, to put honour upon Religion. The intention good, but the services unwarrantable, being without, or against the rule, and consequently shall finde no better entertainment at the hand of Christ, than this act of the Disciples did.

Would

Would we be sure our services shall finde accep-
tation, bee first sure of a warrant (Gods warrant)
for what we do. Otherwise, what ever shew of love,
or wisdom there may seeme to be in them, wee shall
but lose our labour. Instead of pleasing God, dis-
pleasing him. So saith the Text of this act of the
Disciples here: [*When Jesus saw it, hee was displeased.*]

And wherefore displeased? what was it that hee
rooke so ill at their hands? 4. For answer, See a
three-fold ground of this displeasure, even a three-
fold injury involved in this one act of the Disciples.
An injury 1. to the Children; 2^d, to those which
brought them. 3^d, to Christ himselfe. Touch upon
each.

The ground
of Christs
displeasure.

viz. A three-
fold injury
offered by his
Disciples.

First, Here was an injury offered to these poore In-
fants, whom the Disciples in keeping them from
Christ, prejudiced, and (as much as in them lay) hin-
dered in the matter of their salvation. A greater injury
they could not have done them.

1.
To the In-
fants, in kee-
ping them
from Christ.

Observ.
The greatest
injury.

Appl. Let Anabaptists looke to it, who debar chil-
dren from Baptisme. Herein what doe they but as
much as in them lyeth, debar them from coming un-
to Christ? debar them from union and communion with
him? The greatest cruelty that can be exercised upon
these innocent Lambes. *Non est hoc Christianum* (saith
one writing upon this History) *sed plane Herodianum,*
vel si maius Aegyptiacum. This is so farre from Chri-
stian charity, that it is rather Herodian, or (if you will)
Egyptian cruelty. Cruelty exercised not onely upon
the bodies, but upon the soules also of poore Infants.
Certainly, what ever the Anabaptists thinks of it,
this is a thing which Christ cannot take well at their

Use 1.
This injury
charged upon
Anabaptists.

Ferus in Marc
c. 19. v. 13.

14. 1. 11. 12.

hands. Hee that was so displeased with his Disciples for keeping back these children for comming to him upon earth, will not bee well pleased with any that shall have any hand in hindering them from coming to him being now in Heaven. No one thing that Christ taketh worse at the hands of any, than to bee hinderances to others in coming to himselfe.

In the feare of God take wee heed of it, of being any wayes necessary to so great an evill. Expresse and dreadfull is that Commination of our Saviours, Mat. 18 vers. 6. *Who so shall offend one of these little ones which believe on mee, it were better that a milstone were hanged about his necke, and that he were drowned in the midst of of the sea.* Offend one of these little ones, scandalize them, lay stumbling-blockes in their way for them to stumble at, to impede and hinder them in their salvation. No one thing that Christ taketh more heinously than this. So much may bee collected from the punishment there mentioned. Better that a milstone were tyed about his necke, &c.] That, it seemeth, (as Jerome noteth upon it) was the usuall punishment wherewith the Jewes were wont in those times to punish the most Capitall offenders, viz. Tye a stone about their necks, and so plunge them into the water. No crime more heinous in the eye of God, than this; the scandalizing, offending any that doe but begin to looke towards Christ, and towards heaven, so to offend them, as that they should bee put off from Christ, as that the worke of their salvation should any wayes be hindered. All of us beware of it.

If we can any wayes bee furtherances to others in bringing

Take heed of
hindering
the salvation
of any.
Mat. 18. 6.

Hieronymus ad Loc.

John 1. 41.
42.

bringing them to Christ, this do we. So did *Andrew* to his brother *Simon*, having himselfe found the *Messias*, he brings his brother to him. So did *Philip* to *Nathaniel*. So did the *Samaritan* woman to other of her friends and neighbours. Doe we the like. The best office that wee can performe to any. But take heed of hindering them, whether by our *evill counsel*, or *evill example*, or else by the *abuse of our Christian liberty* in things indifferent. Every of these three wayes men may bee, and often are hindered from comming unto Christ.

vers 45. 46.

Iohn 4. 28.

29.

Which may be done three wayes.

First, By *evill counsell*. Thus the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* hindered many from comming unto Christ, in the dayes of his flesh, from believing on him, viz. by their pernicious counsels, and wicked suggestions, whereby they set them off what they could.

1.
By evill counsell.

Secondly, By *evill example*. So did some of the *scandalous Jewes*, who made their boast of the *Law*, but no conscience of it; they thereby brought an evill report upon the wayes of God, making the name of God evill spoken of among the *Gentiles*; (as the Apostle Rom. 2. 23. chargeth it upon them) And thus do *scandalous Christians* at this day, who doe *Gentes agere sub nomine Christi*, beare the name of *Christians*, but live like *Heathens*, walking counter to their profession, they make the name of God evill spoken of amongst those which are wicked, confirming and hardening them in their wickednesse. Even as the *Spaniards* in the *Indies*, who by their horrid cruelties which they exercised upon the *Natives* there, they so prejudiced them against *Christ*, and his *Religion*, as that they professed their willingnesse rather to go

2.
By evill example.

Rom. 2. 23.

24.

to hell with their owne Country-men, then to heaven with the Spaniards.

3.
By the abuse
of Christian
libertie.

3. By the *abuse of Christian libertie in things in-
different*. Hereby also Christians come to give of-
fence unto others, laying stumbling blocks in their
way. Of this I shall speak somewhat more fully here-
after. Every of us take heed of every of these. Know-
ing that we cannot doe a greater wrong or injurie to
any, then to be any wayes a cause, or occasion of
hindering them from *coming unto Christ*. Here was
the first errour in this act of the disciples; they
were hereby injurious to these *Infants* themselves.

2. Injurie to
those who
brought these
Infants, dis-
couraging of
them.

Luk^e 22. 31.

2. They were injurious to *those that brought them*.
By *checking*, and *rebuking* of them, they did as much
as in them lay to take off the edge of their good
affections towards Christ, to *weaken* them, to *dif-
hearten*, and *discourage* them. A thing very improper
for the disciples to doe. It being their office to *con-
firme*, and *strengthen* those which were weak. That is
the charge which our blessed Saviour giveth unto Pe-
ter. *When thou art converted strengthen thy brethren*. This
they should have done. No wonder then that our
Saviour was displeased with them; to see and heare
them *disheartning*, *checking*, those whom they should
have *encouraged*, and *strengthened*.

Applica.

Take heed of
discouraging
or offending
the weak bre-
thren;
Iob 4. 3, 4.

This also take we heed of. If we can any wayes
promote, and further the worke of *grace* in any, by *en-
couraging*, *strengthening*; this doe wee. So did holy
Job in his time, (as Eliphaz giveth the attestation
to him.) *Job 4. Behold thou hast instructed many, and
thou hast strengthened the weak hands; Thy words have
upholden him that was fallen, and thou hast strengthened the*

the feeble knees.] The like doe we according to ability and opportunity. But take heed of *disheartning*, *discouraging*, *weakening*. It is a thing which Iesus Christ will not doe, [*A bruised reede shall he not break, and the smoking flaxe will he not quench.*] Take heed how we doe it, or be any wayes accessory to it. Take heed of being any wayes *offensive* to our *weake brother*. Whether it be 1. By word, as the *disciples* here, or 2^{ly}. By evill example, as *Peter* by his *Judaizing*, and *dissembling*; or else 3^{ly}. By the *abuse of our Christian libertie in the use of things indifferent*. Isaiah 42. 3.
Math. 12. 20.
2 Gal. 12. 13.

This oft-times proves matter of *scandall* unto others. And such scandals take we heed of. It is *Pauls* caveat to his *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. 8. Take heed lest by any meanes this libertie of yours become a *stumbling-block* to them that are weak.] In this case Christians must restrain, and abridge themselves, not doing what otherwise they may doe: exemplary is that resolution of the Apostle in the last v. of that Chapter. [*If weate scandalize my brother, (offend him, so as to make him to offend, which is properly to scandalize) I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, that I may not scandalize my brother.*] Christians in this should be very tender, very carefull how they offend, or grieve their weak brother by the use of their *Christian libertie*; much more how they cause, or occasion him to offend. [*It is good (saith the Apostle to his Romans) neither to eat flesh, nor to drinke wine, nor anything where by thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.*] Three severall words expressing (as I conceived) one and the same thing, but not without an emphasis, intimating the great and speciall care that Christians should

Specially by the abuse of Christian libertie.
1 Cor. 8. 9.

2. last.
Rom. 14. 21.

Rom. 14. 21.

The Doctrine and practice of Pædobaptisme

should have for giving any kind of scandall to their weake brethren, whereby either to *grieve* their spirits, or *distract* and *unsettle* their judgements, or much more to cause them to *offend*, by stopping them in, or turning them aside out of their way. This take we heed of, doe all that we can to *further* others in their way, take heed of *hindering*, *stopping*, *diverting* them. Cherish and *blow* up the *sparkes* of grace in others what wee can; but beware of casting a drop of water upon them, either to *dampe* or *quench* them. This was the *disciples* fault here in the text. Instead of *welcoming* and *encouraging*, and furthering these new-comers unto Christ, they *beate* them off. A thing which their Lord and master taketh ill at their hands. [*He was displeased with it.*] Here was the second *injurie* involved in this act of the disciples: They were injurious to the *persons* which brought these children: Thirdly they were herein injurious to their Lord and master, Christ himselfe; and that in going about to straiten his jurisdiction, and lessen his *Kingdome*. Of this *Kingdome*, *Infants* and children are a considerable part. Now to keep them from coming unto Christ, what a diminution was it to his *Kingdome*?

3. Injurie to Christ himselfe; hindering his Kingdome.

Applic.
Charged upon Anabaptists.

Surely this wrong doe *Anabaptists* unto Christ in debarring children from *Baptisme*, and denying them to be *members of the Church*, and to have any right to the *Covenant of grace*. Herein how injurious are they to the *Kingdome of Christ*? In cutting off so considerable a part from all communion with the *beast*, and *beelie*, Christ, and his *Church*. The story tells us of the *Israelites*, when they had done the great

execu-

execution upon the Benjamites. [They sate downe and wept, repenting them for Benjamin their brother, because there was a Tribe cut off from Israel that day, Judg. last.] And what lesse doth the Anabaptist in cutting off Infants from communion with Christ and his Church? In so doing there is a Tribe cut off from Israel; which though it be the Tribe of Benjamin; the youngest Tribe, yet is it not the least, but a very great and considerable part of this bodie. This act of theirs calls for repentance. To which leaving them.

Take wee heed lest any of us come under the same guilt, in any other kinde least we be any wayes back-friends to the Kingdome of Christ, by withdrawing our selves, or others from visible communion with the misteriall bodie of Christ. Our selves. [If any man withdraw himselfe, my soule shall have no pleasure in him, Heb. 10.] Others, by seducing them, drawing them from visible communion with Christ in his Ordinances. What is this but a dismembring of the bodie of Christ? A thing which he cannot but be sensible of. I wish they may so be, who stand guilty of it. David when hee had but cut off the lap from Sauls garment (the skirt of his robe) his heart smote him. What is it then to cut off a lambe from the bodie of Christ? Take wee heed of having any hand in it.

Take heed of being back-friends to this Kingdome by withdrawing our selves or others from visible communion with the Church. Heb. 10.38.

1 Sam. 24.5,

6.

adw haimba

-modi 1510

u/v of 20151

-unmoo ald

Can wee doe any thing to enlarge, and increase the Kingdome of Christ, this doe wee. And as all ought to doe it, so the Ministers of Christ in speciall, whom Christ hath sent forth with the same commission, as that great feast-maker in the Gospel did his servant, ordering him to goe into the streets

Let all seek it the enlargement of this Kingdome, specially Ministers, Luk. 14.21.

and lanes, and high wayes, and hedge rowes, and to bring in all that he met with, compelling them to come in, that his house might be filled.] This are we the Ministers of Christ to doe. *Invite, perswade, command, compell,* (I meane in a spirituall way, making use of spirituall weapons, which are the weapons of our warfare, viz. the sword of the spirit put into our mouthes) compell men, all sorts of persons to come in unto Iesus Christ, that they may have communion with him, and benefit by him.

2 Cor. 10. 4.
Inviting and
compelling
men to come
unto Christ.

Quest.

Whether
men may be
forced to vi-
sible commu-
nion.

Ans.

No, they
must come
willingly.
Psalm. 110. 3.

But what then, must men be forced to come unto Christ? To have communion with him in his Ordinances, though against, or without, their wills?

Not so. *Thy people shall be willing (or come willingly) in the day of thy power.*] They which come to Christ must come willingly. So did they which brought these Infants here in the text. This is the maine marke of the ministers of Christ, to worke up- on the wills of men, of unwilling to make them wil- ling, to bring off their wills to desire and seek com- munion with Christ, that they may come, and come willingly.

Object.

Are all to be
admitted who
offer them-
selves to visi-
ble commu-
nion.

Ans.

Yes, unless
there be some
just obstacle.

But what if they doe come, and come willingly, offering, and tendering themselves to visible com- munion with Christ? are they now to be received, admitted to the Ordinances?

Surely yes. Unless there be some just obstacle to hinder them. That was the case of these Infants here in the text. They were brought unto Christ, and there was no just obstacle to hinder them, and therefore the disciples ought not to have kept them back. No more (for ought I know) ought the

Mini-

ministers of Christ to repell, and reject any who come willingly unto Christ, desiring communion with him in his ordinances, I meane in the Sacraments, whether Baptisme, or the Lords Supper. There being no just obstacle, no just exception against them, they ought not to keep them back. True it is, where there is a just obstacle, as, viz. where the person is ignorant, or scandalous, in this case there ought to be a suspension from these ordinances: Sacred things ought not to be prostituted to all comers. But otherwise, I see not how the ministers of Christ can debar any from visible communion with Christ, who offer themselves to it, without incurring the displeasure of their Lord and master, as here the disciples did, by putting back these Infants against whom no just exception lay. [When he saw it, he was much displeased, saying, suffer little children to come unto me, &c.]

And so I am fallen upon the second particular observable in this Historie, which informs us what our Saviour said to his disciples upon this act of theirs. Where we may first take notice of the charge hee giveth them, viz. that they should freely permit children to come unto him. [Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not.] A double charge, or rather one and the same charge expressed, 1. Positively, [suffer little children, &c.] Then Negatively, [and forbid them not.] The latter is but an infirmement of the former. Put them together, they hold forth unto us this maine truth. That the grace of Christ extendeth even unto Infants, have a right to, and are in Christ, and

2. Our Saviours speech to his disciples: Where

1. His charge to them.

Observ.
The grace of Christ reacheth unto Infants,

are capable of benefit by him as well as others. Wherefore else should Christ call them unto himselfe? So hee did (as St. Luke noteth it) But *Jes-*
 Luk. .8. 16. *us called them unto him.*] Them, i. e. the Infants; So the Greek expresseth it. *ἡ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ἰησοῦς.* And wherefore else should he give so strict a charge concerning them, that they should have free access unto him? Had hee no interest in them, nor they in him. Surely the grace of Christ reacheth them as well as others.
 Reason. It must needs be so, otherwise there were no hope of salvation for them. In Adam (the first Adam) all dyed. The same dying, all the branches dyed in it, and with it. So as now the whole posteritie of Adam are all concluded and shut up under death. [Death
 1 Cor. 15. 22. *passed upon all, for that all have sinned,* (saith the Apostle.) All subject to a temporall, lying under the power of a spirituall, bound over unto an eternall death. Such (amongst other) is the condition of Infants; which appeareth in that they are subject to temporall death as well as others. [Death reigned
 Rom 5. 12. *from Adam unto Moses even over them which had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression.*] It is over Infants who had not sinned as Adam did, actually in their owne persons. Yet death reigned over them, they were subject to a temporall death as well as others. A plaine evidence that they were, and are guiltie of eternall death as well as others. Now there is no way, no meanes of deliverance, no way to be freed and exempted from this common condition, but by Christ. [Even as in Adam
 1 Cor. 15. 22. *all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive,* (saith the Apostle.)

Apostle) i.e. all that are in him. Even as all that were in the first Adam dyed in him; so all that are in the second Adam (Christ) shall bee quickned in him. Or, all that are made alive, they are made alive in Christ, and by Christ. Freed from eternall death by his merit; from spirituall death by his Spirit; from temporall death by his Power. [I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.] No life, but in, by, and through the second Adam, Christ. So as if Infants ever come to eternall life, they must come by, and through Christ, as well as others. There being no name by which Salvation can be expected, but only the name of Iesus Christ.

ver. 2. and 3.
to be. 16. 3. and
Ioh. 14. 6.

Act. 4. 12.

Object.
Infants cannot come unto Christ, & not capal le of benefit by him.

Ioh. 6. 37.

Verf. 35.

But how can Infants have any interest in Christ, or receive any benefit by him, when as they cannot come unto him? This our blessed Saviour saith, all that his Father hath given him must do, and shall do. [All that the Father giveth me, shall come unto me, &c.] Now, what is it to come unto Christ? Why, to believe on him. So our Saviour him selfe explaineth it, verf. 35. [He that cometh unto mee shall never hunger, and he that believeth on mee shall never thirst.] The latter explains the former. To come unto Christ, is to believe on him. Now this Infants cannot doe. How then can they be said to have any interest in Christ, or receive any benefit by him?

Sol. 1.

Ans. To this it is answered diversly. Some in the (first place) conceive that in this case the faith of the Parents is sufficient. Hereby the children of believers (say they) are brought unto Christ, even as these children here, they were brought unto Christ in the armes of their Parents; so are Infants (say they) brought home unto Christ, in the armes of their

The faith of the Parent conceived sufficient.

The Doctrine and practice of Pædobaptisme

Parents faith, laying hold upon the Covenant of grace, both for themselves, and their children.

2.
Infants may
have a seed of
Faith.

Secondly, Others conceive that even Infants are subjects capable of faith; if not of actual, yet of habitual faith. German fidel, a seed of faith; the Spirit of God working in them *pro modulo*, according to their capacities. Hereof I have spoken more fully heretofore.

3.
Being given
to Christ,
they shall be
brought to
him one way
or other.

Thirdly, For the present (in the third place) let it bee sufficient that some of them are given unto Christ in Gods eternall Election. And being given unto him, they shall come unto him one way, or other. (*All that the Father giveth me, shall come unto me.*) If they live to yeares of discretion, they shall come unto him (as I may say) upon their owne feet, by an actual faith. In the meane time they are brought unto him by a secret worke of the Spirit, working upon their natures in a hidden and mysterious way, for the changing and renewing of them. Herein if we know not the way, yet let not us question the thing, seeing we have so plaine an expression from the mouth of truth it selfe. *Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not.*

Applica.
To Anabap-
tists.

Applic. A Charge, and a Prohibition, both so directed against the Anabaptists of the times, as if they had been purposely intended against them. Whether our blessed Saviour did foresee what errors would spring up in these last times, and so intended to make this as a Provision against them, I will not say. But sure I am, a more direct Provision could not have beene made. In denying Baptisme unto Infants, what doe Anabaptists lesse than the Disciples here did? even (as much as

in them lyeth) forbid children to come unto Christ. Which act of theirs, how distastefull it was to him, the first words of this verse expresse, [*Hee was displeased:*] And how contrary to his minde, the like practise is in any other, the latter words explaine. [*Suffer little children to come unto me, & forbid them not.*]

For of such is the Kingdome of God.] Passe we now to our Saviours Reason, whereby hee convinceth his Disciples of their error, in repulsing these Infants, keeping them backe from comming unto him, and consequently (as much as in them lay) debarring them from entring into that Kingdome, to which they have as good a right and title as any others. [*For of such is the Kingdome of God.*]

The reason
of this charge

The Kingdome of God, (by way of Explication) in phrase of Scripture is three-fold, his Kingdome of Power, Grace, Glory. You have them all three put together in that pithy doxologie, the close of the Lords Prayer, [*Thine is the Kingdome, the Power, and the Glory.*]

Kingdome of
God, 3. fold.

First, Gods Kingdome is his Kingdome of Power, even the powerfull government which God exerciseth, in, and over the world, and all the Creatures in it, all which are subject to his Providence, even the least, and most contemptible amongst them. *The Sparrow upon the house top: the hayre of our head,* both of them numbered and ordered. This universall Government is Gods Kingdome. [*The Lord hath prepared his Throne in the Heavens, and in his Kingdome ruler over all.*] Psal. 103. 19. his Kingdome of Power. [*Thy Kingdome is an everlasting Kingdome,* (saith the Psalmist, Psal. 148.) What Kingdome? why, his Kingdome of

Of Power.

Matt. 10. 29,

30.

Psal. 103. 19.

Psal. 145. 13.

power.

Vers. 11.

power. So he explains himselfe, vers. 11. [They shall
speake of the glory of thy Kingdome, and talke of thy
Power.]

2.
Of grace.noted in
the text

Mat. 6. 13.

noted in
the text

Rom. 14. 17.

Luke 17. 21.

3.
Of glory.

Luke 12. 32.

1 Cor. 6. 9.

Secondly, Gods Kingdome is his Kingdome of
Grace; even that speciall gracious government, which
hee exerciseth over his *Elect*; whom having Prede-
stinat^{ed} to Grace, and Glory, he calleth out of the world,
to have union and communion with *Iesus Christ* the
head of this Kingdome, guiding and governing them
by his *Word* and *Spirit*. Of this Kingdome, we finde
frequent mention in the new Testament. [Seeke first
the Kingdome of God (saith our blessed Saviour) viz.
his Kingdome of Grace.] So the following words
explain it. [The Kingdome of God, and his Righte-
ousnesse;] viz. Righteousnesse of *Iustification*, and
Sanctification; wherein this Kingdome of Grace con-
sisteth. [The Kingdome of God is Righteousnesse, (saith
the Apostle,) The Kingdome of God is within you,
(saith our Saviour,) His Kingdome of Grace.]

Thirdly, Gods Kingdome is his Kingdome of Glory;
even that glorious and blessed estate, wherein himselte
reigneth, and shall reign with millions of *Saints* and
Angels unto all eternity; full of heavenly glory and
felicity. Of this speaketh our Saviour. [Feare not
little flocke, it is your Fathers will to give you a Kingdome;
the Kingdom, viz. the Kingdom of
Heaven, which is the Kingdome of God.] [Know ye not
(saith the Apostle) that the un-righteous shall not in-
herit the Kingdome of God.] A three-fold Kingdome.

Quest. Now of which of these shall we understand
our Saviour here in the Text?

Ans. To this I might answer, not of one, but
of

of all. Take it which way we will, we shall finde a truth in it. [*Of such is the Kingdome of God.*]

First, *His Kingdome of power.* Infants they are subjects of this Kingdome. Over them God exerciseth a Providence, a speciall providence, and that both in the wombe, and from the wombe. David acknowledgeth both as touching himselfe. [*Thou hast covered mee in my mothers wombe: Psal. 139. Thou art hee that tooke mee out of the wombe: Psal. 22. vers. 9. I was cast upon thee from the wombe: vers. 10. &c.*] It is God that preserveth Infants in the wombe; It is hee that bringeth out of the wombe, in both which his Power and Providence are wonderfully manifested. And he it is that taketh care of them afterwards, providing for them, as he doth for other of his Creatures. Hee that heareth the young Ravens when they cry, much more heareth the cries of poore helpless Infants. [*God hath heard the voice of the Lad,*] saith the Angel to Hagar concerning her sonne Ishmael. Thus the cries of poore Infants come up to heaven, prevailing oftentimes for themselves, sometimes for others. So did the Infants at Nineveh, [*Jonas 4. vers. last.*] Thus the Kingdome of Gods power belongeth, and reacheth unto Infants. A consideration not un-usefull unto Parents in respect of their children. But I will not dwell upon it. The phrase in the Text, (though it taketh in this, yet) it riseth higher.

Secondly, In the second place, Infants, as they are subjects of Gods kingdom of Power, all of them; so of his Kingdome of Grace, some of them. [*Of such is the Kingdome of God,*] viz. his Kingdome of Grace, which consisteth as well of Infants, as any others. They may

Infants subjects of all these.

1.
Of Gods Kingdome of power.

Psal. 139. 13.

Psal. 22. 9.
10.

Psal. 147. 9.

Gen. 21. 17.

Icn. 4. 11.

2.
Of the Kingdome of Grace.

Children of believing Parents, members of the Church. be subjects of this Kingdome, *members of the Church.*
 First, Of the *Church visible.* So are all the children of believing Parents. The Parents themselves being subjects of this Kingdome, *visible members of this mysticall body,* such are their children also. So the Apostle concludes it, Rom. 11. *If the root be holy, so are the*

Branches.] Where, by the *Root* we are to understand, the *Patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob:* By the *Branches,* the people of the *Jewes,* their lineall offspring, their *naturall branches,* as they are called v. 21.

ἡ ῥίζα ὅλη καὶ ἡ κλάδος. From which expression, it is well collected by some, that by the *Root* in that place, cannot be meant *Christ* (as *Origen* of old, and our *Anabaptists* at this day would have it,) in as much as *Christ* hath no such *naturall Branches.* His *Branches* are all *Institutional,* ingrafted, *κλάδοι μὴ ἑστῆσαν ἀλλὰ ἑστῆσαν καὶ ἑστῆσαν.* *Branches* not by *nature,* but by *Grace.* The *Root* there is *Abraham,* and other of the *Patriarchs,* the *Jewes* Progenitors: who are so called, not in regard of their *persons* (as *Calvin* well noteth upon it;) but in regard of the *Promise* which was made to them, and to their *seed.* In respect of that *Promise,* that *Root* was *holy;* holy, in respect of a *federall holinesse,* the holinesse of the *Covenant.* Now the *Root* being such (saith the Apostle) such are the *Branches.* Their *progenitors* being in *Covenant,* such was their *Posterity.* Such were the children of *Abraham* then, and such are the children of *believers* now. The one being *holy,* so is the other. Holy, not in respect of any *inherent quality* of holinesse, but in respect of *outward privileges,* and *prerogatives of grace,* grounded upon the *Promise* made to the faithfull and their seed. The

for-

former cannot, but the latter may, and doth descend from Parent unto the childe. *A wise man doth not al-* Prov. 17. 21.
ways beget a wise sonne, communicating his wisdom to his childe; But a *free-man* begets a *free man*. The Acts 22. 28.
 childe being borne free by vertue of his fathers Charter. Thus, though *inward holinesse* is not transmitted from the Parent to the childe, yet *externall holinesse* may, *federall holines* may. Thus *Jews* begat *Jews*, and *Christians* now beget *Christians*. Who yet are such (let that be still taken notice of) not by vertue of *naturall generation*, but by vertue of the *Covenant*, the Promise which is made unto the faithfull, and their seed. Thus the *Root* being holy, so also are the *Branches*. The *Parents* being in *Covenant*, so are their *children* to be accounted. They are all of them members of the Church visible.

Secondly, I, and some of them of the Church In-
 visible, not only belonging to Gods *Election of grace*,
 but subjects of his *Kingdome of grace*: Such as Christ
 exerciseth a gracious government upon, and in, *Re-*
generating, Justifying, Sanctifying them, induing them
 with his *holy Spirit*. That Christ doth exercise such
 an operation in, and upon some Infants, it must not
 bee denied. Two instances are usually brought to
 prove it, the one of *Jeremy*, the other of *Iohn the Bap-*
tist, both which are sayd to bee *sanctified* in the
 wombe. So was *Jeremy*. [*Before thou camest out of the* Jer. 1. 5.
wombe, I sanctified thee.] But this (I confesse) I dare
 not build upon. By [*Sanctification.*] I take there to
 be meant only a *separation* unto a speciall use and ser-
 vice. So the next words seeme to expound it. [*I*
sanctified thee, and ordained thee a Prophet unto the Na-
tions.]

The Doctrine and Practice of Paedobaptisme

knoweth that he cometh to be the *Sanctification* where
 spoken of. No man *in* *sub* of any *in* of grace into
 his soule, (that faith Mr. Calvin, is *in* *argum*), the
 Text will not beare it, but onely a designation, a set-
 ting of him apart unto his prophetically office. To
 waive that. The latter is cleere. *John the Baptist*, he
 was sanctified in, (or from) the wombe, and that
 by the secret worke of the Spirit upon his soule. The
 Text is expresse. *[He shall be filled with the holy Ghost,*
even from his mothers wombe.] This God did to him.
 The like he can doe for others, and no question fre-
 quently doth it; Communicating his Spirit even to
Infants, though not in so large a measure as to the
Baptist, yet in such a measure as may be sufficient for
 them, sufficient to make them, and prove them sub-
 jects of this Kingdome of God, his Kingdome of
 Grace.

Of the king-
 dome of
 glory.

Psal. 84. 11.

Rom. 8. 33.

2 Cor. 1. 22.

Ephes. 1. 14.

Thirdly, to give them a right to, and interest
 in his Kingdome of glory. That also is the Kingdome of
 God, and of such is the Kingdome. A truth which
 necessarily followes upon the former. Being subjects
 of Gods Kingdome of grace, they have also right to
 his Kingdome of glory. *[He shall give grace and glory,*
Psal. 84.] Grace as the first-fruits, Glory, as the full
 crop; the one a pledge, a seale and earnest of the other.
 But upon this I will not insist. I presume I shall meet
 with none so uncharitable as to deny or question it.
 Come wee rather to make some Application of this
 Truth.

Applica.
 A warrant
 for Baptizing
 infants,

Use 1. Here is first a Warrant for what the Church
 of God in all Ages hath practised, the Baptizing of
 Infants. This the Church hath done, and thus it doth.

I, but *quo jure?* (saith the *Anabaptist*) what warrant hath it for it? why, *Christs* owne warrant, who here telleth us, that of *such* is the *Kingdome of God*; the *Kingdome of Grace*, and *Kingdome of Glory*. Now being *subjects* of this *Kingdome*, they have right to the *priviledges* of subjects; amongst which, this *seale* of the *Covenant* is none of the least.

Repl. I, but (saith the *Anabaptist*) we mistake the *Text*. How so? Why, the *Text* doth not say to [them] *belongeth*, or [theirs] *is the kingdome of God*, but of [such] *is the kingdome of God*; τοις των not τω τω, meaning thereby (say they) not those, or any other *Infants*, but such as are like unto them in some *qualifications*. So divers *Interpreters* expound it. *Non istorum, sed talium*, Not of these, but of such. Such as are like to those *Infants*. Like them, *non aetate sed moribus*, not in age, but in manners, in some imitable *qualities*, as viz. *Innocency*, *Simplicity*, &c. So much (say they) may be collected from the verse after the *Text*, where our *Saviour* explaineth his owne meaning, what he meaneth by [such] viz. such in *humility*, [*Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdome of God as a little childe, he shall not enter therein.*] Such are the *children* (say they) to whom our *Saviour* here averres the *Kingdom of heaven* to belong. And thus they think to clude and evade the force of this *Argument*, and the evidence of this *Text*, triumphing in this *subter fuge*.

Replica.
The Ana-
baptists evasi-
on. Not
[Them] but
[Such]

Theodor.
Aquin.
Stella.

Ans. But all in vaine; as will easily appeare, if we do but consider the true *mean* of our *Saviour* in this place, as also the true *sense* and *meaning* of the *word*.

Solus.
Cleared.

1. From our
Saviours in-
tent.

First, for the former, our *Saviours intent*. The text is cleare. Hee was *displeased* with the disciples for *repelling* of these *Infants*, and hee giveth this as a reason to convince them of their error, [*For of such is the kingdome of God :*] viz. those *Infants*, and others like unto them in age: otherwise his Argument had been of no force. [*For of such &c.*]

2. From the
proper sense
of the word
[*such.*]

Nehem. 6. 12

Philem. v. 9

Rom. 1. last.

Gal. 5. 21.

Forth word (*τοιαύτω*;) [*such*] it cannot be conceived to exclude these *Infants*, but to take them in, as primarily and properly here intended. So the word is commonly used (as in our ordinary speech, so) in phrase of *Scripture*. Parallel instances are very obvious. Should [*such*] a man as I fly, (saith *Nehemiah* meaning himselfe.) Paul writting to *Philemon*, [*For loves sake* (saith he) *I rather beseech thee, being [such a one as Paul the aged]* *τοιαύτω*, *Such a one*, meaning himselfe. [*Those which doe [such] things* (saith the same Apostle) *are worthy of death.*] *τα τοιαύτα πεποισμενα*; such things, viz. those things before specified in the Chapter, and things of like nature, as himselfe expoundeth it, *Gal. 5. 21.* Thus the word is commonly used *inclusively*, still taking in the thing, or person it selfe, to which any other is *equalized*, or *coupled*. If need were, more instances might be mustered up: But I shall save that labour. In the meane time challenging our *Adversaries* to shew any one place in all the *Scriptures* where the word is so used as they would interpret it in this text, viz. Where the word (*such*) is put *exclusively*, excluding the person or thing it selfe, to which any other is compared; but so as still it intends either *directly* and *peculiarly* the same person

person and thing instanced in, or else *that*, and others like unto it. So without question must it be understood here in the text. Of [*such*;] i. e. these *Infants*, and others like unto them, whether in *age* or *condition*. So as there can be no advantage justly taken from the word.

2. Nay (as it is well pressed by some) it maketh the more strongly against the adversarie. [*Of such*] is the kingdome of God, *τοῦτον*, not *τῶν*. *Non horum, sed talium*; Not of [*these*,] but of [*such*.] Plainely importing, that the Kingdome of God did belong not only to those *particular Infants* then and there brought unto him, but unto *them*, and *others* that should at any time be brought unto him after the like manner. The word [*such*] is of larger extent, then [*them*.] Had our Saviour here said, *to them* belongeth the kingdome of God: Then might the Anabaptist here have found a more colourable evasion; alledging that Christ who knew all things, might know them to be *elect*, and so might say that, *theirs was the kingdome of God*; but that it could not from thence be inferred, that any other of like condition could claime the like right to it. But saying [*such*,] now hee taketh in others with them, even all that should be offered and presented unto him after the like manner.

The argument retorted.
Chemnit.
Musculus ad loc.

Conclude we it then: This Argument ordinarily taken up by Divines from this text of scripture, for the maintenance of *Infants Baptisme*, it is of force and validitie, carrying out the cause against all opposition. *They to whom belongeth the kingdome of God, who are subjects and members of the kingdome of Grace, and heires of the kingdome of Glory, they have right to this*

The Doctrine and practice of Paedobaptisme

this *seale of the Covenant*, whereby this their interest may be confirmed and sealed up unto them. This by way of Instruction.

Use 2.

Comfort & hope to believing Parents touching their Infants dying without Baptisme.

In the second place, here is a ground of comfort and hope unto believing parents as touching their children, whom God is pleased to take *ab utero ad uterum*, from the grave of the wombe, to the wombe of the grave; cropping them in the bud, taking them hence before ever they know the right hand from the left; it may be, before such time as they could be made partakers of the *seale of the Covenant*. Yet let not such parents *mourne as men without hope*. Let them not perplex themselves with a doubtfull anxietie touching their eternall state, and condition. The text in this case yeelds a ground of comfortable hopes. [*Of such is the kingdome of God*] saith our Saviour here concerning these Infants, who were as yet onely intentionally tendred to him, not actually touched by him. Is it so that we have done the like for our Infants? Presented and tendred them unto Christ, and to this Ordinance in the unfeigned desires and intentions of our hearts, doubt not but the *kingdome of heaven is theirs*, theirs as well as any others. You know who spake it, [*In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither male, nor female, (and I may adde, neither young, nor old) for they are all one in Christ Jesus.*] Being given unto Christ, they shall come unto him, be brought unto him one way or other; and coming unto him they shall be all alike saved by him, made partakers of the same Kingdome with him. And thus much for this Reason, as it is here simply propounded.

Gal. 3. 28.

Verl.

Vers. 15.
*Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive
 the kingdome of God as a little childe, he shall
 not enter therein.*

Come wee now to looke upon this our Sa-
 viours reason as it is illustrated and amplified in
 the verse following; viz. by an Argument a ma-
 jori (for Piscator conceives of it,) an Argument from
 the greater to the lesse. As if he had said: Wonder
 not at this that I have said, that the kingdome of
 God belongeth to Infants, I tell you more; whoso-
 ever would enter into this Kingdome must become
 an Infant; an Infant by way of resemblance; imi-
 tating, and being made like unto such a one in some
 imitable and observable qualities. Otherwise hee
 never shall, he never can enter into this Kingdome.
 [Whosoever, &c.]

Our Saviours
 Reason am-
 plified.

Piscat. Anal.
 in loc.

Mat. 18. 3.
 Observ.

The wordes make up but one entire proposition,
 or conclusion. In effect the same with that which we
 meet with *Matth. 18. 3.* Where our Saviour (upon
 an other occasion) taking a little childe, and setting
 him in the midst of his disciples, hee propounds him
 to them as a patterne for their imitation; telling
 them. [Verily I say unto you, except yee be converted,
 and become as little children, yee shall not enter into the
 Kingdome of God.]

Mat. 18. 3.

Observ.

All that
 would enter
 into Gods
 Kingdome
 must become
 as little chil-
 dren.

Behold here then a patterne for every one of us.
 As many of us as would enter into Gods Kingdome (his

H b

King-

The Doctrine and Practice of Paedobaptisme

Kingdome of grace and glory,) we must become as little children.

Explic.

Ioh. 3.

Resembling
Children in
some imita-
ble qualities.

Q. As little children? How shall this be? What must aged persons (according to *Nicodemus* his conceite of the doctrine of *Regeneration*) *repuerascere*, turne children againe?

A. Yes. This aged persons oft-times doe in a naturall way. *Bis pueri senes*. Old men are twice children. And all Christians must doe it in a supernaturall and spirituall way. They must be twice children. As once by nature, so once by grace: and that by the imitation of children in some of their imitable qualities.

Q. But what qualities are these? Wherein must Christians be like unto children?

A. To single out some particulars, some of the chiefe.

6. Without
malice.

1. A first is that which the Apostle himselſe propounds to, and preſſeth upon his *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor. 14*. Where hee sheweth them both wherein they should not be like unto children, and wherein they should. *Non mentibus, sed moribus*. Wherein not. Not in understanding. Herein he would have them not children, but men. [Brethren, be not children in understanding, &c. But in understanding be men.] *Perfecti*, perfect, *Adulati*, of ripe age. Wherein then? why in malice. [How be in malice be ye children.] Children they are free from malice, and envie, there is not so much as a sparke of this fire in those breasts. Herein a patterne for Christians, even for all that would enter into the Kingdome of God. Let them in this become as children, laying aside malice. So St. Peter proſſeth it. [Wherefore laying aside all

1 *Cor. 14. 20.*

1 *Pet. 3. 3.*

all malice, &c. As new borne babes desire the sincere milk of the word.] New borne babes are voyd of malice. So should all Christians bee. Not seeking, nor wishing evil to any; wishing, and doing what good they can to all, but hurt to none. As children concerning malice.

Secondly, as children concerning guile. So the Apostle Peter there goeth on. [Laying aside malice, guile.] Such are infants, as doves; there is no guile, no fraud, no deceit, no hypocrisie in them. They doe not pretend one thing, and intend another. They doe not goe about to over-reach, or circumvent others, but in all their actions there is a plaine-hearted simplicitie. And such should Christians be, simple as doves. So our Saviour preffeth it upon his Disciples. I, simple as children, [Simple concerning evil,] (as Paul explaines it) without guile; and that;

2. Without Guile.

Math. 10. 16
ἀπεσταλτοὶ ὑμῶν ὡς τὰς ἀγνούς.
Cui nihil est admixtum.
Rom. 16. 19.
ἀπεσταλτοὶ ὑμῶν ὡς τὰς ἀγνούς.

1. In their actions.
1 Thes. 4. 6.

2. In words.
1 Pet. 2. 22.

Ephes. 4. 29.

Ephes. 6. 14.

1. In their actions; not circumventing, defrauding others. So the Apostle preffeth it upon his Thessalonians, 1 Thes. 4. That no man goe beyond, or defraud his brother in any matter.] As, viz. in buying and selling, and bargaining, &c.

2. Without guile in their words. This is the character which Peter gives of his Master. [Who did no sinne, neither was there guile found in his mouth.] So should it be with Christians; there should be no guile in their mouths, in their words, in their promises, testimonies, &c. So Paul chargeth it upon his Ephesians. [Therefore putting away lying, speak the truth every man to his neighbour.] Truth is the Christians guile. [The guile of wrath.] And in this sense

the Proverbe holdeth true. *Vngirt, unblest.*

3.
In heart.
Psal. 32. 2.

3. Without guile in their hearts and spirits. It is one branch of *Dauids* description of a blessed man. [*Blessed is the man in whose spirit there is no guile.*] Such is the spirit of a childe. There is no guile, no hypocrisie in it. It is such a one as it seemeth to be. And O that it were so with all Christians. That they were in this respect as children. As children for *sinceritie*; without guile. Here is the second of these properties.

3.
Children for
humility.
Mat. 18. 4.
An childe sit-
ting in the
dust, an Em-
bleme of hu-
mility and
contentation.

3. A third followes. As children concerning *pride*. Children for *humilitie*. This I take from our Saviour himselfe in the place forenamed. *Whosoever shall humble himselfe as this little childe, &c.* Children, we see how humble, how lowly they are. Their spirits are not haughtie, high minded. There are no proud, ambitious, vaine-glorious, aspiring thoughts in them. They are as well content with their rags, as with their robes, with a cottage as a palace, often sitting in the dust. An embleme of *humilitie*. A childe sitting in the dust, and as well contented there as if it were a throne. Such should Christians be, of humble and lowly spirits. Such a frame of spirit we finde in the man after Gods own heart. [*Lord, mine heart is not haughtie, &c.* Surely I have behaved my selfe as a childe, &c.] It is not for Christians to have haughtie hearts, or lofty eyes, if so as to have high thoughts of themselves, nor seek high things for themselves. [*And seekest thou great things for thy selfe?* Saith the Lord to *Balaam*.] seek them not. This will not children, this should not Christians doe. Their spirits should be low,

Psal. 138. 6.

Iere. 45. 1st.

Ephel. 4. 2.

Ephel. 6. 1.

low, so as they may be willing to embrace the *Dust*, if God shall bring them thither. This carnall wicked men sometimes do by *constraint*. So shall *Babylon* do. [*Come downe and sit in the dust, O Virgin daughter of* Isa. 47. 1. *Babylon.*] *Babylon* a *Virgin*; (So called, because then not *deflowred* by the enemy. Even as Cities that were never sacked nor conquered, but have enjoyed a long continued peace, they are called *Virgin, Maiden-Townes*; as *Venice* in *Italy*, *Dordrecht* in *Holland*: so *Babylon* there, in that respect is called a *Virgin*;) She shall sit in the *dust*, saith the Prophet (which is long since accomplished in *typicall*, and ere long shall be in *mysticall* *Babylon*.) And this Gods own sometimes doe, [*They which were brought up in Skarlet, embrace dung-hills*;] It is sayd of the *precious sonnes of Sion*, the *Nobles of Israel*, Lam. 4.) and this they ought to do willingly, when God calls them to it. In this (as I sayd) like *children*, who if their *Parents* set them in the *dust*, they are willing withall. Is it so, that God is pleased at any time to bring any of his children from high estates, to meane and low conditions, to set them in the *dust*; I, suppose with *Job* upon the *dung-hill*, yet should they herein submit to the will of their heavenly Father: Ever having their *spirits* as low as their *conditions*. Herein again should *Christians* be as children: Children in *humility*, putting on this as a *robe*, being *clothed* with it, as the *Apostles* both *Peter*, and *Paul* presse the exhortation. Fourthly, to this (in the fourth place) let me joyn another quality not much different from the former, and that is *Contentation*. A quality very observable in young children. If they have but enough to suf-

Lam. 4. 5.

Col. 3. 12.

1 Pet. 5. 5.

Contentati.

om. 1. 1. 1.

2. 1. 1.

fiſe nature, how contented ſhall we ſee them. If they have but *cloathes* to keepe them warme, be they *rich*, or *meane*. If they have but *food* to ſatistie their hunger, and drinke to allay their thirſt, how quiet are they. What their Parents give them, they receive, and are contented with it. Oftentimes *put to bed with a little*. In this again ſhould Chriſtians be as children, Content with their heavenly Fathers portion, whatever it bee, be it much, be it little. It is the Apoſtles

Phil. 4. 11.

leſſon; A leſſon which himſelfe had taken out. [I have learnt in whatſoever ſtate I am, therewithall to be contented.] And a leſſon which he reads others. [Ha-

2 Tim 6. 8.

ving food and rayment, let us therewith be content.] A leſſon which very nature can teach, and ſometimes hath learnt. *Natura paucis.* Nature is content with a little. Meere naturall men how contented doe wee finde them oftentimes in their meane conditions. And ſhall not grace doe it much more? (by Iſa)

5th
Innocency.

Fifthly, Againe, children are *Innocent*, harmleſſe creatures. So we uſe to call them. [*Innocentes.*] And it is no other language, than what the Spirit it ſelfe is pleaſed ſometimes to make uſe of. [*In thy ſkins is*

Iere. 2. 34.

found the bloud of the poore innocents.] So it is charged upon *Hieruſalem*, Jer. 2. And who were theſe poore *Innocents*? Calvin and ſome others, underſtand it of the *Prophets* of God, whom they had ſlaine cruelly, and cauſleſſly. But it may ſeeme rather to be meant of *Infants*. So the ſame *Prophet* alſo where ſeemeth to expound himſelfe, chap. 19. where charging upon *Hieruſalem* the ſame ſinne, [*They have filled this place (ſaith he) with the blood of Innocents.*] And who were they? The next verſe explains it, *giving little*

Iere. 19. 41

Verſ. 5.

Diodat. ad loc

chil-

children whom they offered up unto *Molech*: These were the *Innocents*, with whose blood they had filled the valley of *Gehinnon*. Such are *children*, and such should *Christians* be. *Innocents*, though not to Godward, (which yet they must endeavour) yet to manward. *Harmlesse*; So was our heavenly patterne. *Holy, harmlesse, &c.* In this should *Christians* labour to resemble him; being *innocent as Doves*, (so our Saviour preffeth it in the place forenamed.) I, *innocent as children*: Having *innocent hands*, and *innocent tongues*. Two properties of a man that shall ascend the hill of the Lord. So *David* maketh them. [Who shall ascend into thy Hill? *Psal.* 24. He that hath cleane (or *innocent hands*.) *vers.* 4.] Who shall abide in thy Tabernacle, who shall dwell in thy holy hill? *Psal.* 15. He that back-biteth not with his tongue, &c. *vers.* 3.] Such hands, such tongues have *Infants*, both *innocent*. And such should the hands and tongues of *Christians* be.

Heb. 7. 27.

Mat. 10. 16.

Ἀνέπαυτοι,

ab a &

ἀέπαυ, sine

cornibus.

Scap.

Psal. 24. 4.

Psal. 15. 3.

6.

Forgiving &

forgetting

injuries.

Luke 17. 3.

Psal. 86. 5.

Sixthly, To these I might yet adde many more. Children are apt to forgive and forget injuries. If they be angry, yet they hold it not, they are easily appeased and reconciled. And in this respect againe, should *Christians* be as children, *viz.* apt and ready to forgive, and forget wrongs and injuries. A lesson which our blessed Saviour frequently inculcates upon his disciples. [If thy brother trespass against thee, forgive him, and if he trespass seven times in a day, yet forgive him.] In this should *Christians* *Partake*, resemble their heavenly Father. Being ready to forgive, so is hee. [Thou O Lord art good, and ready to forgive, *Psal.* 86.] Not retaining their anger. So doth not hee. [He will

not

The Doctrine and practice of Pædobaptisme

not alwayes chide, neither will he keepe his anger for ever;
 Psal. 103. 9. Psal. 103.] Anger rests not in Gods bosome against
 his children; Let it not rest in ours against our bre-
 thren. *Let not the Sun go downe upon your wrath,* (saith
 the Apostle) Ephe. 4.] In this be like unto children.

7. Making use of cries and teares for their weapons.
 Exod. 2. 6. *Seventhly,* Againe, children being wronged and
 injured by others, what are their weapons? Why,
 their cries, and their teares. This was Moses his Rhetorick,
 wherewith he tooke Pharaohs daughter, when she opened the Arke;
 [*Loe the Babe wept.*] In this should Christians bee as children in all their straights
 and difficulties, making use of these weapons, their prayers,
 and their teares, crying to their Heavenly Father. Bnt passing by this, name but one more.

8. Obedienceto their heavenly Father.
Eighthly, And that is a very observeable one, viz. their obedience;
 Obedience to their Parents, to whom they submit, and subject themselves to be ordered
 by their commands, being afraid of their threatenings,
 standing in awe of their frownes, readily believing, and firmly
 building upon their promises. And herein should Christians bee as
 children; yeelding such an absolute obedience to their heavenly
 Father. Submitting to his commands, trembling at his threats,
 awed by his frownes, readily believing, and confidently resting
 upon his promises. All this, without any *Ifs* and *Ands*;
 without disputing about them, or demurring upon them.
 This is that which our Saviour here principally driveth at in the Text.
 [*Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdome of God as a little childe.*] viz.
 receive the mysteries of this Kingdom, yeelding an humble and
 submisive obedience to the will of God revealed in his Word.
 Therein making more use of

Faith

Faith, than either of sense, or reason. So doe children, they believe what is told them, what is promised them, specially if it be by their Parents; therein (as I may say) making more use of their *believe*, then their *reason*. And this must Christians doe, in apprehending heavenly mysteries; they must captivate *sense* and *reason*, bringing them both to the obedience of *faith*; yeelding an absolute and universall, both *creedence*, and *obedience* unto God, in what ever hee shall make knowne to them, to be according to his will. In all these (besides many other qualities, for the Argument is very fruitfull, would we follow it so farre as we might,) ought Christians to imitate and resemble children.

But do we thus resemble them? Let that be the first use that we make of it. Bring we it home to our selves; enquiring whether we be all like children, in all the forenamed particulars, viz. without *malice* as children; without *guile* as children; *hand-guile*, *tongue-guile*, *heart-guile*. Without *pride*, as children; *innocent* and *harmlesse* as children, apt and ready to forgive and forget injuries as children; ready to poure forth cries and tears into the bosome of our Father, as children; as ready to yeeld *obedience* to our heavenly Father, as children to their naturall Parents. Are we *such*? O that every of our hearts could now *Echo* backe againe, and say, *such* we are. Such in our measure, such at least in unfeigned desire, and serious endeavour. But, alas, is it not far otherwise with some amongst us? Are there not some whose hearts are full fraught with *rancour*, *malice*, *envy*? their hearts, hands, tongues full of *guile*, full of *deceitfulness*, full of *hypocrisie*? Is

Applica.

Enquire whether wee be such..

The Doctrine and Practice of Pædobaptisme

there not a spirit of *pride* in some of us, filling their hearts with ambitious, vaine-glorious thoughts; making them thinke highly of themselves, and meanly of others; puffing them up, and exalting them above measure? Is there not in some of us a spirit of *discontent*, so as we are not contented with Gods dispensations and dealings; but upon all occasions, if we have not what wee would have, our hearts are ready to repine and murmur? Are there not some amongst us, who care not what *wrong*, what *injury* they do to others, so they may but benefit and advantage themselves? Are there not others of an *implacable spirit*? Being once offended, once provoked, they will never be reconciled; never forgive, much lesse forget injuries? Are there not some who do not know what it is to *un-load their cares*, their *fears*, their *sorrowes* into the bosome of their heavenly Father, by *pouring forth their soules* before him? And are there not others who *walk stubbornly* against God, not regarding either *precepts*, or *promises*, or *threatnings*; no, they are obstinate: *Their necke is an iron sinew*, and *their brow brasse*; (as the Lord complaines against the people of the *Jewes*.) Surely, *such* there are, some of every of these sorts to bee found amongst us.

Na. 48. 4.

All who are
not such shut
out of Gods
Kingdome.

And is this to be *like unto Children*. In this to receive the *Kingdome of God as little children*. Let the Conviction take place with those to whom it belongeth, who may here see themselves *shut out of the Kingdome of God*. Marke the Text. *Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdome of God as a little childe, he shall not enter therein.* As for such then

asserted and vindicated.



then who are *un-like* unto children, it may bee every wayes *un-like*, *un-lesse* happily therein, wherein they ought not to resemble them, *viz.* in *knowledge*, and *understanding*. [*Brethren, be not children in understanding* (saith the Apostle.) Herein happily they are too like unto children, having no more understanding in spirituall matters, the mysteries of Gods kingdome, then they. But in all other *imitable qualities*, they are altogether *un-like* them. Now let not such flatter themselves with vaine hopes, of ever entering into Gods Kingdome. No, it cannot bee. Hee that is *Truth* it selfe here speaketh it; and hee speaketh it both *earnestly*, and *peremptorily*. So much will appeare from a re-view of the words. Ioh. 14. 6.

First, *earnestly*. So much that *Asseveration*, which we meet with in the entrance of the Text, imports. [*Verily I say unto you.*] *Amen*; which in the beginning of a sentence hath the force of a vehement *Asseveration*, importing a serious and earnest affirmation, or negation.

Secondly, *Peremptorily*. [*He shall not enter.*] There is an Emphasis in the originall, which our Translation here hath not expressed. *Ὁὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ*. Two *negatives* put together, which in the Greeke tongue do *vehementius negare*, confirme the negation or denyall of a thing (like two witnesses to a Testimony) making it more peremptory, more certaine. [*He shall not enter.*] *Nequāquam ingrediētur*. He shall [*in no wise*] enter. So we finde it translated else-where, and so it ought to be here. *Ὁὐ μὴ*, [*In no wise*] or [*by no means.*] Ioh. 6. 37.
Thus is the Kingdome of God both *locked*, and *bolted* against all such. *Locked*, and that by him who

Rev. 3. 7.

hath the key of David, who shutteth and no man openeth. Bolted, and that with a double bolt. Oh wd, He shall in no wise enter. Thus hath Christ put it out of doubt. [Who-soever shall not receive the kingdome of God as a little childe, he shall not enter therein.]

Vse 2.

Be we as children.

Vse 2. Let this then (in the second place) bee a motive to every of us, setting on this usefull exhortation, that we would labour to be such. Would we enter into the kingdome of God, of Grace here, of Glory hereafter; Be we as children. It is a Copie (you see) which our blessed Saviour himselfe hath set before us. Let us write after it; propounding this patterne to our selves, study to imitate it. *Be we as children.* As children without malice, as children without guile, as children for humility, as children for contentation, as children for innocency, forgiving and forgetting injuries as children; upon all occasions complaining to our heavenly Father as children; Obedient as children. Imitate we them in every of these.

Specially in the last. That the Text leadeth us to more particularly. *Receive we the kingdome of God as little Children.*

Receive the Kingdom of God as children.

The [kingdome of God] (as I told you) is here, his Kingdome of grace, and glory. His kingdome of grace. The government which hee exerciseth in and over his Elect upon earth, whom he guideth and governeth by his Word, and Spirit. His Kingdome of glory. That blessed state which hee hath provided for his Elect hereafter. Now receive we both these as little children, viz. *humbly, submissively.*

His kingdom of Grace,

First, Thus receive we his kingdome of grace. Yeolding up our selves (as little children do themselves to

to their Parents, and Governours) to bee instructed and ordered by him, according to his good will and pleasure. Resigning up our *understandings*, and our *judgements* unto him. So doe little children, they yeeld themselves as an *abratatabula*, white paper for their *teachers* to write any thing upon, what they please; receiving their *instructions* quietly, submissively, without quarrelling or cavalling. Even thus receive we the Kingdome of God, the *mysteries* of his Kingdome. Such *truths* as God hath been pleased to reveale unto us in his Word, let us receive them, entertaine them quietly, readily, with a holy submission of our *understandings*, and *judgements*; not standing to quarrell with, or cavill against any truth of God, because we cannot apprehend the *reason* of it. Herein looke upon our patterne. *Children* do not apprehend the *reason* of things which are taught, and told them; yet they receive them, and believe them. The like do we in the *mysteries* of Gods Kingdome.

1. *Captivating our understandings and judgements*, yeelding up both unto God, to receive, and believe what ever is held forth unto us in the Word. And then 2ly. In like manner yeeld up our *wills* and *affections*. Let Gods will, be our will, to which let us stoope and submit, though contrariant, and crossing to our wills. So doth the *childe*. Though happily it may be crossed in what it would have, and doe; yet it submits, it yeelds. Even so doe wee. Yeeld wee up our selves (as to be *instructed*, so) to bee ordered by God; to be in what state and condition he pleaseth, to doe, and to suffer what he will have us to do.

To be taught
by God.

To bee orde-
red by h. m.

Thus behave we our selves in *life*, even as a *child*. In life.

So did *David* as himselfe telleth us, *Psal. 131.* [*Surely Psal. 131. 1. I behav'd and quieted my selfe as a Childe that is weaned, &c.*] A childe in the *weaning* is froward, and tangle, then nothing will please it but the *breast*. But being once weaned; then usually it is quiet, and contented with any thing. In this be we as children; not like children in the *weaning*, so as if we have not what we would have, nothing shall please us. But like *children weaned*; behaving our selves quietly, and contentedly; yeelding up our selves to the ordering of our heavenly Father.

In death.

And thus behave we our selves in *death*. Therin also as *children*. Children, *Infants*, as they are ordered by their *Mother's*, or *Nurses* in the *day*, so they are put to bed by them at *night*, when, and where, and after what manner they please; for the most part falling asleepe in the *Nurses* lap. Even thus do we resigne up our selves unto God our heavenly Father, to be disposed of him, as in *life*, so in *death*: to be put to bed, the bed of the *grave*; when, and where, and after what manner he please. Falling a sleep in his lap, in his *armes*, committing our soules unto him as to a *faithfull Creatour*, and *mercifull Redeemer*. Thus receive we Gods *Kingdome of Grace*, his government here upon earth.

1 Pet. 4. last

2.
His Kingdom
of Glory.

1.
Receiving it
upon Gods
tearmes.
Rom 6. 23.

And secondly, Thus receive we his *Kingdome of Glory*. Still as *little children*. Receiving it in Gods way, and upon his *tearmes*. Thus do *little children* take things from their *Parents* hands, upon their *Parents* *tearmes*, and in what way they will have them. And thus receive we this *Kingdome of God*.

Receive it, first upon Gods *tearmes*, viz. as a *free gift*,

gift; freely bestowed upon us, without any merit, any desert of our own. Thus do *little children* receive every thing at their Parents hands. All of gift. Never dreaming of any merit, any desert in themselves.

Secondly, Receive it in Gods way: in what ever way he shall in his Providence lay out to bring us to heaven by. Even as the *Israelites*, so they might but come to *Canaan*, they care not what way they go; be it through the sea, or through the wilderness. What if God will lay out unto us the like way to bring us to our heavenly *Canaan*; a troublesome and tedious way, yet banke it not. [I presse forwards towards the marke, (saith the Apostle). *Εἰ πῶς*, If by any meanes I might attain the Resurrection of the dead.] Herein yeeld we up our selves unto God to be led by him, as sheep. So it is sayd of *Israel*. [The Lord led them as a flocke, (as a flocke of sheepe, as the word signifieth) by the hands of Moses and Aaron.] Or (to hold to the Text) as *Children*. Children are led by the hand, or carried in the armes of their Parents, whether they will have them. Even so yeeld we up our selves to the will of our heavenly Father. So he may but bring us to heaven, let him lead us, and cary us which way he pleaseth. What ever the *searimes* be, what ever the way bee; let us accept of this gift at his hands. Receiving the Kingdome of God as *little children*. And thus I have done with this speech of our Saviour to his Disciples.

In Gods way

Phil. 3. 11. 14.

Psal. 77. 10.

Verf.

Vers. 18.

*And taking them up in his Armes, hee layd his hands
on them, and blessed them.*

Christs act
tow: rds these
Infants,
three-fold,

Come we now to the last branch of this story, which informes us what our blessed Saviour did to these Infants. Herein we may take notice of a three-fold act; the two former introductory to the latter. 1. His *Safception*. 2ly, His *Imposition of hands*. 3ly, His *Benediction*. [*1. He took them up in his Armes.* 2ly, *Hee layd his hands upon them.* 3ly, *And blessed them.*]

Thus doe these *Petitioners* receive what they desired, and more. That which was desired for these children, was onely a *touch* of our Saviours hands. So the 13th ver. of this Chapter expresseth it. [*They brought children unto Christ, that he should touch them.*] Now this he doth for them, and more. [*Hee embraced them in his Armes, layd his hands upon them, and blessed them.*]

Obfer.
God some-
times doth
for his peo-
ple above
their desires,
Ephef. 3. 20.

Malac. 2. 15.

Thus God is pleased some-times, often-times to doe for his people above their desires. This hee can doe. [*Now unto him that is able to doe exceeding abundantly above all that we aske or thinke, (saith the Apostle.)*] God can doe for his people exceeding abundantly above their desires, or thoughts. There being in him abundance of Spirit, as the Prophet Malachi hath it. [*Did not he make one? yet he had abundance of Spirit.* (So the Geneva readeth it, *Residuum Spiritus* (saith Montanus)

a Resi-

a residue (as our new translation hath it) an over-
plus of spirit, that is, of power and vertue to have done
more then he did. Whereas God at the first made
but one woman for one man, it was not for want
of power; hee could have made more if hee had
pleased. He hath no measure of his power, but his
will. [If thou wilt, thou canst,] saith the leaper to our
Saviour. So as out of this plenitude, and abun-
dance of power God is able to supply all the wants
of his people; to doe for them above their desires:
which also sometimes he doth. Solomon having his
choice to aske what hee would, hee begs wisdom
from God; [Lord give me an understanding heart.]
God giveth him that and more, viz. riches, and ho-
nour: [I have also given thee that which thou hast not
asked.] The poor Paralytick in the Gospel is brought
unto Christ for a bodily cure: Christ doth that for
him, and more; sending him away with a double
cure; the one of his bodie, the other of his Soule.
[Sonne, thy sinnes are forgiven thee: Take up thy bed and
walke.] Thus Christ dealt with others; and thus
ordinarily he dealeth by all that come unto him:
doing for them above their desires, and thoughts.

[The ground whereof is, his abundant mercie. That
is the epithite St. Peter giveth it. [According to his
abundant mercie.] Rich mercie: So the Apostle St.
Paul; [God who is rich in mercie.] God is rich, as
in power, so in mercie. The one maketh him able, the
other willing to doe for his people above their de-
sires. As a man having a large purse, and a large heart, he
giveth to a poore beggar more then he askes: He

Math. 8. 2.

1 King. 3. 12,
13.

Math. 9. 1.
v. 6.

Reason.
He is abun-
dant in mercie
1 Pet. 1. 3.
Ephes. 2. 4.

askes a penny, hee gives him two. Thus God dealeth with poore suppliants that come unto him in the sense of their wants suing for mercie. He often doth for them what they desire, and more. Being, as rich in himselfe, so rich unto them. [God is rich unto them that call upon him.] (saith the Apostle.) God is rich, having an abundant fulnesse of all goodnesse of himselfe. And hee is rich not to himselfe, (as the covetous miser is,) but unto others: Being ready and willing to communicate, and set out his goodnesse unto all that seek it, (even as the fountaine that is ready to communicate of his water to all that come for it, and bring vessels to receive it.) And that not sparingly, (saith St. James.) He giveth us richly all things to enjoy. (saith the Apostle.)

Applica.
Come unto God and Iesus Christ.
1. By prayer.
2. By faith.

A meditation which may serve as a forcible motive, and inducement to make us come unto God, and to Iesus Christ. Unto God by prayer: Unto Iesus Christ by faith.

1. Come we to the throne of Grace for a supply of our wants what we aske, being offered for us, wee shall receive. [Whatsoever ye shall aske the Father in my name, it shall be given you,] (saith our Saviour.) [Aske, and it shall be given you,] It what you aske, and more. God giveth, and he giveth not sparingly, but liberally: Therefore come wee, and come boldly. [If any man lack wisdom, let him aske of God,] (saith St. James.) why? For he giveth to all men liberally, and without rebuke, and without contention. Come we unto Iesus Christ by faith: He that made more in him, and from him, then ever

wee thought of. So did these mothers (or who-
ever) that brought these their children unto Christ.
They found more tenderneſſe, more love, more af-
fection in him, then they could have expected. They
come for a touch; he embraceth, bleſſeth them. Such
over-flowings of mercie there are in God, and in
Jeſus Chriſt towards poore ſinners. The prodigall
coming to his father, little did he dreame of ſuch
affection, ſuch entertainment as he met with. His
thoughts were, if he might but get a roome in his
fathers houſe, to eate bread with his ſervants, that was
all he could looke for, and more then he was wor-
thy of. But ſee what he found: No ſooner doth
his father ſee him a ſcore off, but he runs to meet him,
falls upon his neck, and kiſſeth him, bringeth forth the
beſt robe, and killith the fatted calfe for him. Such o-
ver-flowings of unexpeced, undeſerved mercie and
compaſſion there are in our God towards poore
penitent ſinners. Upon their returning and com-
ing home to God they ſhall finde abundant mer-
cy, abundant compaſſion, more then ever they could
have promiſed to themſelves, conſidering their own
unworthineſſe of the leaſt mercie. And therefore
come we unto God, and come we unto Jeſus Chriſt.
But this I take up by the way, from the joynt con-
ſideration of the words.

Come we now to looke upon particulars: And
therein begin with the firſt act, viz. The act of ſuſ-
ception, [He took them up in his armes.] *in* *arma*
genuis, *Complexans eos*, (ſaith the vulgar latine) Em-
bracing them. But the word (by Piſcators leave) in-
genuis

Luk. 15, 20,
21.
archid

arguill
north
archid

archid

The first act,
viz. Supcep-
tion.
Piscator
ad locum.

Luk 2, 28.

These children were Infants.

Suidas.

Obfer.
Christs singular affection to Infants.

Chemnit. Har. adloc.

Ev rā; dy-
xaloy; pēp-
pōuon dū-
tū; dyaxiō-
ne. Zenoph.
Pæd. 7.

proper significarion importeth more. Not any kind of embracement, but an *embracement peculiar to children*; whom others use to take in their armes. Thus *Simeon* embraced our Saviour, when his Parents came to present him in the Temple, *Simeon tooke him up in his armes*; ἐπιλαβὼν αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἀγκύλαις. Which is but a *periphrasis*, of the word in the text, giving us the true sense and meaning of it. Surely even as *Simeon* there embraced our Saviour, so did our Saviour here embrace these *children*: *In ulnas suscepit. Hec tooke them in his armes.*]

From whence (by the way) it is rightly concluded against the Anapabtrists, that these children which were brought unto Christ, they were *young children*; not children capable of Instruction, but *Infants*, παιδὲς ἀναγκαστικῶς. Little children, such as were brought in the *armes* of their parents unto him, and by him taken into his armes. But letting that passe, That which we shall here take notice of, is, the singular *affection* of Iesus Christ towards these *Infants*, which he expresseth by this act of his: *Taking them into his armes*,] that so hee might (as it were) lay them in his bosome, nigh to his heart, *tanquam charissima*, τανquam (as *Chemnitius* glosseth upon it) as a deare and choice treasure which he made speciall account, and reckoning of. Thus doe tender *mothers* (not knowing how better to doe it) expresse their affection to their babes, taking and carrying them in their armes, as neere their heart as may be, embracing, and hugging them. And how could Christ have expressed greater af-
fection

139019

s x X

fection to these babes then he did so. And did he shew such affection to them? How then dare any shew such dis-affection towards them, as to shut them out of the Church, whether triumphant, or militant? Triumphant, So doth the Papist all children dying without Baptisme. Militant, So doth the Anabaptist, who denies Baptisme unto Infants, because (as they would have it) they are no members of the Church. And what rigour? What unwarrantable, uncharitable, and unchristian rigour is this? What is this, but even (as it were) to pull Infants out of the armes of Iesus Christ? Surely, he who tooke these Infants into his armes upon earth, doth as much to some of them, being now in heaven, and will doe the like to such as are rendered to him as these were; viz. brought to him in the armes of their Parents faith. He will receive them, embrace them, take them into the armes of his mercie. And there let believing Parents leave them (I meane, their Infants deceased) in a comfortable hope, and perswasion of finding them there another day. I shall goe to him, but he shall not returne to me (saith David of his child). This for the dead. As for the living, take heed how we shut them out of the Church: Seing we here find them in Christs bosome, take heed how wee cast them out of the Churches bosome, by denying unto them the Churches priviledge, the badge and scale of their Christinity. This for Infants.

As for our selves, be we all encouraged to come unto Iesus Christ. He that had armes to receive these poore

Applic.
Papists and
Anabaptists,
herein unlike
unto Christ.

He will well
receive them
as these were
brought to him
in the armes
of their Parents
faith.

2 Sam. 12.23.

Yea ni 10 V. 2
to 10 10 10 10
id 10 10 10 10
10 10 10 10

Use 2.

Be encour-
aged to come
unto Christ,

The Doctrine and practice of Pedobaptisme

poore Infants being brought unto him, once will have armes to receive him, as coming unto him. [Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out.] Hee that cometh unto me, that is, [believeth in me, coming to me as a Saviour, and a Lord, to be saved and governed by me, I will in no wise cast him out.] There is a meaning in the phrase, lesse said, but more intended, I will not cast him out, that is, I will receive him. Surely Iesus Christ hath lost none of his affection, none of his compassion. What he had, he hath: hee carried his Works, and his armes to heaven with him. And therefore come wee unto him, as into his arms, and he will receive us.

Ioh. 6. 37.
Ioh. 6. 44.

Q How shall we come.
A. Not by any power of our owne.
Ioh. 6. 44.

Q How shall we come. A. Not by any power of our owne. This none can come unto Christ. [No man cometh unto me except my Father which hath sent me draw him.] Even as these children could not have come unto Christ, had not their Fathers brought them. Thus unless our heavenly Father bring us, lead us, draw us, (that is, effectually perswade our hearts to believe on him, working upon them by his word and Spirit) wee shall never come. Can never come unto Christ, being of ourselves both unwilling, and unable to do so.

Ioh. 6. 44.

2. Not in any confidence of self-worthiness.

Not yet (secondly) in any confidence of any worthinesse in our selves, as if we should be the rather received and embraced of Christ for any thing that wee bring with us. No, this wee must doctrinally renounce, and that as clearly, as finally, as any. [Nevertheless, whatsoever shall come unto Christ, I will receive him.]

Ioh. 6. 44.

ing with him nothing of his own. So say they, and so say we. Nothing save onely an eye, and a hand (which yet are not our owne neither). An eye to looke up unto Christ, a hand to receive him, both which are done by faith.

And this is the third place, every of us must bring with us. Every one his own faith. The just shall live by his faith. Wherever the case of Infants be, sure we are, in persons of age thus it must be. These Infants here they are brought unto Christ that he should touch them. But the woman with the bloody issue she cometh unto Christ that she might touch him, as also other sicke persons usually did.)

Whether Infants may be saved by their Parents faith, or no, it is disputable. But as for us, it is out of doubt, it is our own faith must benefit us. Even as it is with a child in the wombe, and out of it. In the wombe it is nourished by the meate which the mother eates, but not so out of the wombe, then it must live by the meate which it selfe eateth. Whether it be so with children in their infancy, whether they shall live by the faith of their Parents, it is a question which I will not peremptorily determine. I know it was the opinion of the Antient Church. But afterwards, when they come to years of discretion, then they must live by their own faith. Then they must come unto Christ (as I may say) upon their owne legs, though still led by the hand of another. And thus let us come. So coming, doubt not but he that had power to receive these Infants being brought to him in the armes

2. Bring faith with us. Hab. 2. 4.

Matth. 9. 10.

21.

Mark 6. 56 c.

1. 40.

impediment

about it

A common

of ancient

in case of

1. Benedic-

Gen. 48. 14.

2. Collects

non.

Exod. 29. 10.

Levitic. 8. 11.

in the hand

of

of others, will also have armies, armies of mercie and tender compassion, to receive, to embrace us, coming unto him, believing on him, submitting to him.

Pass we now to the second and third acts, in both which I will be very briefe, hasting to a conclusion of this subject. [He laid his hands upon them, and blessed them.] Wherein we have, first the outward ceremonie or signe, *Imposition of hands*: [He laid his hands upon them.] Then the thing signified, the grace conferred, *Benediction*: [Hee blessed them.] Briefly of each.

Act 2.
Imposition
of hands.
A ceremonie
of ancient use
in case of
1. Benedicti-
Gen. 48. 14.

[Hee laid his hands on them.] A ceremonie of very ancient use amongst the people of God, and that in diverse cases: Specially in two.

1. In the case of *benediction*, and blessing. Thus the Patriarch *Jacob* being to blesse the sonnes of *Joseph*, *Ephraim* and *Manasses*, he laid his hands upon their heads, praying for, and pronouncing a blessing upon them. And thus our Saviour here blessing these children, hee laid his hands upon them.

2. Consecra-
tion.

2. In case of *Consecration*. When a person, or thing was to be set apart to some speciall use, and service, this was done by *imposition of hands*. Thus the sacrifices under the Law were consecrated by the Priests. [Aaron and his sonnes layd their hands upon the head of the sacrifice,] which they did (amongst other ends) in a way of consecration. *Destinatum il-
lad in sacer sacrificium*, (saith *Ofander* upon it,) *de-
stinatum* and setting a part that creature to be a sacrifice. And as their sacrifices were thus consecrated, so

Exod. 19. 10.
Numb. 8. 11.

Ofander ad
loc.

were

were (at least) some of their Church officers also. So we read that the Levites were to be consecrated by imposition of hands, Numb. 8. Thus was it under the Old Testament. And thus we find it under the New. Our blessed Saviour (our great high Priest) being to consecrate the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, hee took the Bread, and hee took the Cup (saith the Text.) Either taking them into his hand, or laying his hand upon them, setting them apart from a common, to a sacred use. And in like manner were the officers of the Church, the Ministers of the Gospell consecrated, set apart to their Ministeriall Offices, by Imposition of hands. A usefull Ceremony in both these cases. Whether necessary, or no, is made a question: *Partists* contend for it as absolutely necessary, making it the outward signe in two of their Sacraments, (so they call them, and make them) viz. Confirmation, and Ordination. In the latter of these (not to speake of the former now, which I have touched upon already,) wee generally allow it, approve it as very convenient, not onely warrantable but usefull, warrantable by the practise of the Apostles, and the Church of God in all Ages. Usefull both in respect of the solemnity, and significat^{ion} of it, fitting well with the businesse that it is applied to, (Ordination,) wherein there is a charge layd upon the person ordained, and the person set apart unto a speciall use and service. Warrantable and usefull we allow it, yet

Numb. 8. 10.

Mat. 26. 26.

1 Cor. 11. 24.

Acts 6. 6.

Acts 13. 3.

1 Tim. 4. 14.

A usefull Ceremony,

though not

simply necessary,

yet expedient.

And

hold

ving it as an indifferent Ceremony, as not being of the essence of Ordination, (much less of Confirmation,) which may be performed without it, viz. by Fasting, and Prayer. And so not absolutely necessary, there being no expresse precept in Scripture to enforce it. As for that obvious Text in Timothy, where the Apostle willeth him not to be on hands suddenly upon any man. It sheweth indeed, what the usuall Rite and Ceremony then was not what of necessity it must be. But of this enough.

1 Tim. 5. 22.
Vide Piscator:
sup. Mar. 19.
Vers. 15.

The signifi-
cation of this
Ceremony,
viz. the con-
ferring of
some gift; su-
per

By bestow-
ing, &c.

Thus Christ
blessed.

Mar. 11. 18.

The case which the Text leadeth us to, is the former of these, the case of Benediction. And with this the Ceremony suiteth well. Importing a putting, or conferring of some gift upon another; whether by bestowing of it, or praying for it. First, By bestowing it. Thus our blessed Saviour blessed these children. Not onely praying for, but bestowing a blessing upon them. (Dei bene dicere est benefacere,) which was in his power, in his hands to do. And therefore hee layed his hands upon them. Blessed hands, hands full of blessing. Into which was, and is committed the dispensation of all blessings, both heavenly, and earthly. This is that which our Saviour saith of himselfe, Mar. 28. (All power is given unto mee, both in heauen, and in earth.) This hee spake after his Resurrection. Not but that he had this power before, how ever from thence forth hee was to exercise it more freely.

freely than formerly. Before this he had all power in his hands; a power to conferre and bestow what blessings, and where hee pleased. Not unfailly then did he lay on hands upon these Infants here, being about to *blesse* them, hee having all blessings in his hands.

Secondly, But to have not others, why then should they lay on hands? I answer, though they cannot conferre them, yet they may pray for them. I, more. In the name of God pronounce them, and make promise of them: And therefore to confirme the persons in the apprehension of obtaining what is so prayed for, so pronounced, so promised; therefore they lay on hands upon them. Thus Jacob in the place forenamed, layd on hands upon the sonnes of Joseph, praying for, and pronouncing a blessing upon them. Thus Moses layd hands upon Josuah, who thereupon was filled with the spirit of wisdom, as you have it, Deut. last. Not that Moses could put his spirit upon Josuah, but he praying for it, God conferred it. And thus the apostles in their time layed their hands upon divers, who thereupon received the holy Ghost, as it is said of those Disciples, Acts 19. Not that they of themselves could conferre the holy Ghost, but God did it by their Ministry. But I promised to be briefe.

A word or two of the last branch of the Text, and so I will dismiss it, and you for the present, *the thing signified by this Ceremony.* [Hee layd his hands upon them, and blessed them.] He blessed them.

2.
By praying for it, and pronouncing it.

Gen. 48.

Deut. last. vers. 9.

Act. 19. 6.

Act. 3.
Christ blessing of these Infants.

them. How? why, by *praying* for a blessing, *pronouncing* a blessing, *conferring* a blessing upon them. All this hee could doe, having authority to blesse, and having all power in his hands to conferre, not onely temporall, but spiritual, and heavenly blessings. [*Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that hee should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.*]

Ioh. 17. 2.

Quest.
What blessing Christ bestowed on these Infants.

Quest. But the question is, what blessing it was that Christ here bestowed upon these Infants. Christ hath many blessings (saith the Anabaptist,) *right-hand*, and *left-hand* blessings. In the dayes of his flesh, hee healed the sicke, cleansed the lepers, made the dumbe to speake, the blinde to see, &c. And who knoweth (say they) but some such blessing it might bee that Christ here bestowed upon them, some *temporall* blessing?

Ans.
Not onely a temporall, but a spiritual and eternal blessing.

Ans. To this wee answer, that possibly it might be so. Hee might, possibly, and probably pray that they might *live* and *grow* in stature, in *wisdom*, and *favour*, and the like. But surely, this blessing of his imports more. The Text telleth us here, that Christ layd his [*hands*] on them. Not one hand, but both. *Christ's blessings when hee was upon earth, seldome went single.* Seldome did he bestow a *left-hand* without a *right-hand* blessing. Seldome did hee cure any in their *bodies*, but hee cured them also in their *soules*. And surely such was his blessing here. More than a bare *temporall* blessing, chiefly, and principally a *spirituall*, and *heavenly*.

heavenly blessing; even the blessing of Gods Kingdome. This hee had before avowed to belong unto them. [Of such is the Kingdome of God;] and the blessing of this Kingdome hee here conferred upon them.

Hee blessed them. And what could hee have done more for them? or for any? This was the best thing that Isaac could doe to, or for his sonne Jacob, to blesse him. And what could Christ have done better for these Infants? Hee blessing them, they were blessed. I have blessed him, and hee shall bee blessed, saith Isaac concerning his sonne. And those whom Christ blesseth, they shall bee blessed.

Observ.
Christs blessing, the best blessing.
Gen. 27. 33.

Applic. O seeke we after this blessing; the root of all blessings. Seeke it for our selves, and seeke it for our Children. Without this, our blessing of them, our providing for them, will be little worth. Let it be our care and endeavour to bring them to Christ; to know him, to believe on him, that hee may blesse them. If he blesseth them, they shall be blessed.

Applica.
Seeke this blessing.

And thus I have (as briefly as I could) run over this portion of Scripture, both in a Doctrinall, and Practicall way; shewing you still (by the way) what it maketh for that end to which it hath beene ordinarily made use of amongst us, viz. the Baptisme of Infants. Such they were that were here brought to Christ. Such they were, whom the Disciples here (out of no ill intent) attempt to keepe backe

The Doctrine and practice of Paedobaptisme &c.

backe from coming to Christ. Such they were whom Christ here inviteth to come unto him, prohibiting his Disciples, or any other to hinder them. Such they were, to whom hee avoweth the Kingdome of God, both of Grace, and Glory, to belong. Such they were whom hee here embraceth, layeth his hands on, and blesseth.

Object. But (saith the Anabaptist) what is all this to the point in hand? All this while wee doe not read that Christ Baptized these Infants.

Answ. True. No more did he any others. [Ie-
sus himselfe baptized not.] John 4. 2. But yet hee

expressed his singular and peculiar affection to them; Invites them to communion with himselfe, avowes the Kingdome of God to bee theirs; and confers upon them the blessing of that Kingdome. And hath Christ thus honoured some of this tender age? What shall you bee done to them, when the King of Heaven delighteth to honour?

Hath hee invite them to communion with himselfe? Who shall keepe them backe, by debarring them of the meanes of that communion?

Doe hee avow, and confers the thing signified, who shall then deny them the sign?

What it maketh for that end to which it hath bene ordinarily made use, viz. the bringing of Infants. Such they were whom the Disciples here (out of no ill intent) attempt to keepe backe

Heb. 6. 6.

GENERAL ORDINANCE

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...